

MODERN PHILOLOGY

VOLUME XXIII

November 1925

NUMBER 2

THE NINE-SYLLABLED PENTAMETER LINE IN SOME POST-CHAUCERIAN MANUSCRIPTS

In the field of fifteenth-century commonplace books or of large-scale "patchwork" copies is to be sought the next step through the mass of post-Chaucerian transcripts. Editors hitherto, despite their announced discriminations among Chaucer's copyists, have in an emergency used an isolated reading offered by any codex; and if, e.g., one group of manuscripts shows a line headless, the opposed group writing it now headless and now full length, the editor will usually remark that "most manuscripts omit" and adopt the full-length version into his text. That is, whatever his published opinion of his witnesses, he will now believe and now disbelieve them, testing them by his own preconception as to Chaucer's metrical practices.

What those practices were can, however, be known to us only through the scribes. We can, indeed, argue from Chaucer's literary mastery to his metrical mastery; but we have not thereby proved that his ideas coincided in every respect with ours; that, for instance, he objected to and avoided the nine-syllabled line; that he may not have accepted such line-forms as variants. Any proof of his views on the point must come from his scribes, through a separation of their personalities and habits from the texts they are copying. If most disfigurements of a text can be removed by comparative editorial study and elimination, it is equally probable that most of the disturbances caused by any one copyist can be detected by a survey of his methods in the transcription of several different poems. Could this be done for a number of Chaucerian texts, could the idiosyncrasies of the various

scribes be recognized and separated, the residuum might not be Chaucer, but it would at least be an X nearer him than is any one of the codices tested, something the sort of X that "critical" editors reach by constructing a genealogical tree of the manuscripts.

This identification of scribes, which I believe to be the next necessary step in Chaucerian and post-Chaucerian work, may be sought along two lines. We may find the handwriting of a known man in several or many volumes, and thus obtain an approximate dating, as in the case of John Shirley. And the script of an unknown workman may appear in various volumes, thus establishing a sort of connection among them. For instance, a man who copies, occasionally from Shirley, in the commonplace books Brit. Mus. Harley 2251 and Add. 34360, who there transcribes extracts from Lydgate's *Fall of Princes* (ca. 1430), had also a hand in the commonplace book Trinity College Cambridge R 3, 21, wrote part of the Royal 17 D xv copy of the *Canterbury Tales*, and wrote the College of Physicians copy of the *Tales*. Prosiegel says his script is also, perhaps, in the Arundel 59 copy of Lydgate's *Secrees*. I make these statements with reserves, as it is years since I examined the manuscripts; I hope that re-examination and photography will soon enable me to place the question before other students. If my opinion of the script is confirmed, this man will have to be reckoned up, both in preparation for an edition of the *Canterbury Tales* and as a stable center in the maze of crisscrossing fifteenth-century texts.

The other line of search for scribal identities is by comparison not of their hands but of their handling. Were the student working over texts without reference to their scribes, he might consider it possible to draw a parallel between Chaucer's story of St. Cecile, as in the Corpus Christi MS for instance, and Lydgate's life of St. Margaret from the Trinity College copy in John Shirley's hand. One could justly emphasize the identity of subject and of stanzaic form in the two poems, and their close agreement in length would make a discussion in percentage-terms very easy. If the student confined himself to narrative management he would be safe enough in his comparison, and in no great danger were he to comment on stylistic points. But if he passed on to compare metrical management and line-structure, he would be on the rocks. For, as the results below presented

will make clear, the deliberate license of Shirley in handling his copies is so constant as to throw suspicion on any isolated reading he may offer; while the personality of the Corpus scribe, so far as I have yet studied him, is not that of a meddler. It is less easy to create for one's self the picture of a man engaged in transcribing a long piece of work like the *Canterbury Tales* than it is to detect the peculiarities of a man working over commonplace books. I therefore open this subject of scribal personality with a study of a clearly defined group of such volumes; and as a clue through the large and varied mass of fact before us, I take the nine-syllabled pentameter line. This approach is less arduous than that of complete editing, but it yields much of the result needed by an editor.

Before listing the manuscripts here used, I have to mention one or two points of procedure. For the sake of exactitude, I have limited myself to the pentameter line as arranged in rhyme royal. I use the term "nine-syllabled line" inaccurately but economically, to denote only the headless line and the line broken-backed, or lacking an unaccented syllable at the verse-pause. There are lines of nine syllables which may jolt, e.g., in the fourth foot, because the scribe there dropped an inflexional *-e*; but such are not here included. There are headless lines of ten syllables; and such are here included. I have marked with an asterisk, in these lists, the lines which become normal if an inflexional *-e* be restored; it has seemed best to present them along with lines definitely below normal, in order that the student may see the probable share of the linguistic change in causing headless or broken-backed line-movement.

It will appear from comparison of these varying manuscript-treatments that the linguistic change did not proceed uniformly. A steady, well-behaved workman like the Fairfax scribe, working not earlier than 1422,¹ is insensitive and indifferent to the value of *-e* in the texts he is transcribing; the translator of the Palladius and his scribes (*ca.* 1430 or later) are either themselves aware of that value or are compelled by supervision to observe it; the line-amplifications of Shirley (*d.* 1456) and of the later Scottish Selden copyist show them both deaf to it. Reading the Palladius-translator's description of his

¹ The poem to Henry VI and his mother, transcribed a few leaves later than the Chaucerian poems of the codex, was written before the infant king's coronation in 1429, and after the death of Henry V in 1422.

patron Gloucester's watchfulness over the work, one pictures Duke Humphrey as a literary conservative, holding fast to the earlier vocalic flow of English, resisting the speech-change he heard around him. And comparing the methods of these different scribes with the state of things in Palladius, the student will probably conclude that an editor is justified in restoring any Chaucerian line awkward because of a fallen *-e*. Chaucer apparently wrote headless lines on occasion; he may still more occasionally have written a broken-backed line; but he must have been at least as exact and as exacting as was Gloucester a generation later about the handling of the inflexional syllable. More than one authentic version of a line or passage is not impossible in Chaucer; but an unrhythmical movement is exceedingly improbable.

And although it is not at all clear that Hoccleve and Lydgate were rhythmically sensitive, I have given them the benefit of the doubt; their lines rough by a missing *-e* are not charged against them.

Conspicuous among the manuscripts here studied, and used for three poems, is Fairfax 16, of the Bodleian Library at Oxford. So far as possible, I have compared it with its sister, Bodley 638 (B), and with its cousin, Tanner 346 (T), of the same library. With the related codex, Digby 181 (D), also of the Bodleian, they constitute most of the C-group of manuscripts of the *Parlement of Foules*; opposed to them is the enigmatic Cambridge Gg iv. 27 and a train of lesser texts, constituting the A-group. From these lesser texts I have sometimes singled out for mention the MSS Harley 7333 (H) and Trin. Coll. Cambridge R 3, 19 (R), late manuscripts deriving apparently from a common source. But in speaking of the A-group here, I speak in-exactly; I have not used for this study all its members. They are cited from the diplomatic prints by the Chaucer Society. The C-group codices also contain the *Black Knight*, and with them, for that poem, can be compared only the Shirley and Selden copies, as set forth under III below; I have used the variants given by Krausser in his edition of the poem, *Anglia* xix. 211-90, and by Skeat in Volume vii of the *Oxford Chaucer*. For the *Letter of Cupid* we have again the Oxford MSS, with a little more chance for comparison; see below under II, where I refer to the EETS edition of Hoccleve and to Skeat's text. The Palladius MSS are discussed in paragraph IV here. For the

Second Nun's Tale, as in list V, I have used the Ellesmere and the Corpus Christi College MSS as published by the Chaucer Society. I do not here include my notes on the *Canon's Yeoman's Tale*, but it has appeared from study of the G-fragment that Corpus, Petworth, and Lansdowne are very closely allied; Corpus much more carefully written than the other two, which are derived apparently from one common source. When Lichfield comes in to supply the Hengwrt's lack of the CYTale, it often runs with CPL as against Ellesmere; and Harley 7334 has in both Tales numerous bonds with CPL. Corpus is a very interesting subject. Differing from Ellesmere in some noteworthy readings, it has no more headless or broken-backed lines, no more losses of *e*-final, and very little metrical unsoundness. It errs grossly sometimes, as described in V below; but is its line of descent much longer, its authenticity much weaker, than those of Ellesmere?

1a. HEADLESS LINES IN THE FAIRFAX 16 TEXT OF
CHAUCER'S PARLEMENT OF FOULES

	LINE
Ne wote how he / quytheth folke her hire	9
So C-group, and two manuscripts in A. GgHR . . <i>how that he, etc.</i>	
But why that I speke / al this not yore	17
So C-group. Gg and others, <i>But wherfore that, etc.</i> HR omit <i>that</i> .	
There Ioy is / that lasteth without ende	49
So C-group, B <i>ioye</i> . Gg <i>There as Ioye is bat last wtoutyn ende</i> ; HR <i>There euer ys ioy wtout any ende</i> . (H varies.)	
And oure present worldes / lyves space	53
So C-group, except D. Gg <i>And that oure, etc.</i> ; HRD <i>And hows oure, etc.</i> See Digby in 156 below.	
At regarde / of heuenes quantyte	58
So C-group. Gg <i>At regard of the heuenys, etc.</i> ; cf. H. R <i>At the regard of the, etc.</i>	
And was somedel / fulle of harde grace	65
So C-group, and so indicated by Gg. HR and St. John's, <i>And ful of turment & of harde grace</i> , which Skeat takes.	
Thyn errour / though thow tel hyt not me	156
So BT; Digby . . . <i>not to me</i> , as A-group. See 53.	
Ther as swetnes ever mo / ynowh is	185
So C-group. FT write <i>mo</i> , others <i>mor</i> . Gg <i>Ther as ther swetnesse, etc.</i> ; St. John's <i>Ther as that swetnes</i> , etc. HR as C, omit <i>mo</i> .	
And further aboute / y gan espye	194
So C-group and R. A-group . . <i>al aboute, etc.</i>	

Herde I pley / and ravysshinge swetnesse	198
All manuscripts but F(B) have <i>so</i> before <i>pley</i> .	
No man may there / wexe seke ne olde	207
So C-group, and one A-MS. Gg <i>No man may waxe there, etc.</i> ; HR <i>Ne no man</i> , etc., taken by Skeat. See IIIa, line 198.	
Somme to slee / and somme to wounde and kerve	217
So C-group. GgH and St. Jo <i>Some for to slee</i> ; R <i>Som for to flee</i> .	
Her names shul noght / be tolde for me	229
So C-group, and two A-MSS. GgHJo . . <i>shul not here be</i> , etc.	
Dame pes sate / a curtyne in hir hande	240
So C-group. A-group . . . <i>wt a curtyne</i> , etc.	
*There myght men / the Royal Egle fynde	330
So C-group; so HR. GgJo . . <i>myghte men</i> , etc.	
*Men myghte in that place / assembled fynde	367
So TD; B <i>myght</i> . Gg <i>myghtyn</i> , Jo <i>myzte</i> , others <i>myght</i> .	
*Benyngly to chese / or for to take	370
So BD, and H; T <i>Benignely</i> . GgR <i>Benygnely</i> .	
Foules / take of my sentence I prey	383
FB only omit <i>hede</i> after <i>take</i> .	
And yf I be founde / to hir vntrewe	428
So C-group. So HRJo; Gg <i>And If that I to hyre be</i> , etc., so in Skeat.	
*Than oght she be myn / thourgh hir mercy	437
So C-group. So A-group; but Gg, Jo, read <i>ouhle</i> , <i>owithe</i> .	
Of thys formel / whan she herde al thys	445
So C and A. Headless in Skeat.	
As wel as my wytte / kan me suffise	460
So C-group, D reading <i>any witt</i> . So H, and R om. <i>me</i> . Gg <i>As wel as that myn wit</i> , etc. Jo <i>As wele as my witt can devise</i> .	
*At short wordes / til that deth me sese	481
Only Gg reads <i>shorte</i> .	
Who that had leyser / and kunnyng	487
TD, and Gg, <i>hadde</i> ; HR <i>had</i> . All manuscripts headless. Skeat <i>Who [so] that hadde</i> , etc.	
*And wol sey my veyrdit / faire and swythe	503
So all but Gg <i>And I wele seye</i> , etc.	
Quod the turtel / yf hyt be youre wille	510
So all but R's <i>Seyde the turtyll</i> , taken by Skeat. See 569, 655.	
That by skylles may non / be brought adon	537
So C-group, D / <i>by</i> . So A-group, except Gg's <i>That non by skilles may been brought adoun</i> , which Skeat takes.	
For sirs taketh noght a grefe / I pray	543
So C-group, TD <i>sires</i> . Gg <i>For serie ne takith</i> , etc., taken by Skeat.	
Hyt may nought as ye wolde / in thys wey	544
So C-group. A-group has <i>gon</i> before <i>as</i> ; so Skeat.	

- Quod the sperhauke / neuer mote she thee..... 569
 All manuscripts but TD thus, headless; they read *Quod tho*, which Skeat does not take, suggesting *Seyde* as 510. In *KnTale* 135, where *tho the* occurs, only Petworth omits *tho*. But consecutive short words, especially if similar, often derailed a scribe; see *pot put* in *CantTales* G 761, and the handling of *ye if it to* in line 656 *ibid.*, of so lo 966.
- Ye quek quod the duk / ful wel and faire..... 594
 So BT, T om. *quod*; D *Ye queke queke said*, etc. Gg *Kek kek zit seith*, etc.; H *3a queke yit saide*, etc., R *Ee kekyll seyde*, etc., St. Jo *Ye keke seyd*, etc. Similar words confused C-scribes.
- Yf I were reson / than wolde y..... 632
 So C-group. HRJo *Yif it were*, etc.; Gg *If I were resoun certis thanne*, etc. Skeat . . hit . . . certes.
- As ys euerych / other creature..... 641
 So C-group; so HR. Gg *As is anothir lyuis creature*; St. Jo *Like as is eny othir*, etc.; Skeat *Lyk as is everiche*, etc.
- Quod nature / here ys no more to sey..... 655
 So C, and all A but Gg H. Skeat adopts their reading with *tho* after *Quod*. Cf. 569, 510 above; cf. CPL. reading of line 424 in V below.

There are above listed, for the six hundred and ninety-nine lines of the Fairfax text, thirty-four headless verses. Of these, five, as starred, depend on the treatment of the inflexional syllable; five (53, 156, 198, 383, 594) arise from omission in the FB or FBT ancestor; and eight (49, ?58, 185, 194, 217, 229, 240, ?544) from apparent omission by the C-ancestor. In line 17 the C-stem deviates from the A-stem. This leaves fifteen lines to be considered, of which six (428, 460, 503, 537, 543, 632) are normalized by Gg alone; one (655) is normalized by GgH, one by GgHR (9), one by HR (207), and one (641) by the St. John's College MS. Five lines remain headless; but only one of them, 445, is recognized as such by Skeat. In 65 he adopts the reading of a subgroup of A, and his procedure in 487, 510, 569, is noted above. If we question his right to treat 510 as he does, and doubt the unsupported testimony of R, we must also doubt the testimony of Jo in 641 and that of HR in 207. Nor is it clear that the C-readings of these lines and of others in the poem are inadmissible. Certainly their rejection in favor of isolated Gg-readings needs further consideration. Nine-syllabled lines dependent on omission we are more inclined to rectify because of the proved weakness of the C-stem in this respect as compared with the A-stem; see, for example, FB's

dropping of *made* in 108, FBT's of *Nature* in 467, the C-ancestor's omission of *hardy*, 338; also the rough C-lines 72, 77, 273, the rough FBT lines 156, 375.

1b. BROKEN-BACKED LINES IN THE FAIRFAX 16 TEXT
OF CHAUCER'S PARLEMENT OF FOULES

	LINE
*That al the day / thought me but a lyte	28
So B; T omits <i>the</i> ; D <i>That all day it thought</i> , etc. Gg <i>That al that day me thouzte but</i> , etc.; HR <i>That all day me thought hit but</i> , etc.	
And ryghtfull folke shul goo / whan they dye	55
So C-group, T writing <i>folk</i> . A-group . . . <i>aflyr they dye</i> .	
Than prayed he Scipion / tel hym alle	71
A-group . . <i>to telle</i> , etc. C-group omits <i>to</i> , except MS Longleat.	
There were vers writen / as me thoght	124
So C-group, and all A but Gg's . . <i>vers Iwrete</i> . R and two other manuscripts <i>verse, versus</i> .	
*Ryght as betwix / Adamauntes twoo	148
So C; but D has <i>For right as</i> , etc., as have HRJo in A. See line 151.	
HR <i>betwene</i> , Gg <i>betwixsyn</i> , Jo <i>betwen</i> . See <i>Black Knight</i> 235.	
But natheles / al though thou be dulle	162
So C-group. GgJo . . <i>al thow that thou</i> , etc., cf. H. R <i>al though thy wyt be dull</i> . Confusion over short similar words.	
The box pipe tre / holme to whippes lasshe	178
So T; gap in B; D . . <i>the holme</i> , etc., but om. <i>tre</i> . Note juxtaposition of short similar words, as line 569 of Ia. A-group <i>The box tre pipere</i> , etc. In A, only R has <i>the (holm)</i> .	
I sawgh a temple of glas / founded stronge	231
All C-MSS <i>founded</i> ; A-MSS <i>Ifounded, enfounded, Ifoundit</i> . Other manuscripts read <i>bras</i> .	
Faire of hem self / and somme of hem gay	234
So C-group. A-group has <i>were</i> before <i>gay</i> .	
Tho was I war / where ther sate a quene	298
So C-group; cf. Jo of A. Gg . . <i>wher that ther</i> , etc.; R <i>where sate</i> , etc.; H has gap.	
*In suche array / men myght hir there fynde	318
So C-group. except T . . <i>ther yfinde</i> . Only GgJo spell <i>mighte</i> .	
?The waker goos / cukkow euer vnkynde	358
Only F om. <i>the</i> before <i>cukkow</i> . Cf. 178 above?	
And eche of hem / did hys besy cure	369
So C-group. So HR. Gg <i>eueriche</i> , Jo <i>euery</i> .	
Haunye rewarde oonly / to my trouthe	426
So BT, and most A-MSS; D writes . . <i>only reward</i> , etc. Gg <i>And haunye only reward</i> , etc. Skeat inserts [al] before <i>only</i> .	

NINE-SYLLABLED LINE IN POST-CHAUCERIAN MANUSCRIPTS 137

Than somme man dooth / that hath serued yore	476
Only F om. <i>ful</i> before <i>yore</i> .	
*Who that had leyser / and kunnyngre	487
See list Ia.	
*Wel bourded quod the duk / by my hatte	589
So C-group, T writing <i>doke</i> . Gg <i>doke</i> , HRJo <i>duk</i> , <i>dook</i> . Skeat <i>doke</i> .	
*For soth as yet / by no maner wey	653
Most manuscripts write <i>maner</i> ; Gg, one C-MS (Longleat), <i>manere</i> .	
*A lorde the blysse and Ioy / that they make	669
BD <i>Ioye</i> ; so GgH in A-group. R <i>Ioy</i> and <i>blisse</i> , etc. In 175, only D, of C-group, writes <i>ioye</i> .	

In this list of nineteen lines, seven (above starred) are harsh mid-way the verse because of a dropped inflexional syllable. Two lines, 124 and 231, are rough because of scribal failure to write the *y-* of the past participle, a fault very common in, e.g., *Canterbury Tales* manuscripts. Four lines (71, 162, 234, 298) depend on omission by the C-stem as opposed to most A-MSS, and three (178, 358, 476) on omission by either FBT or F alone. This leaves three lines for consideration. In 55 is the same sort of difference between groups as in line 17 of list Ia; and in 148 the usual Fairfax treatment of the word *between* jolts the line. In 426 Gg alone adds an emending syllable to the line, not adopted by Skeat, who inserts *al*. Did Chaucer write this verse harsh at the caesura for emphasis on *only*? And are there sufficient lines of this type in the C-stem to give Hoccleve and Lydgate, for instance, the notion that Chaucer sanctioned such verses?

II. HOCCLEVE'S LETTER OF CUPID AS IN FAIRFAX 16

The *Letter of Cupid*, of 476 lines rhyme royal, remains in more manuscripts than does any other of Hoccleve's minor poems. It has just been published (EETS 1925) from the codex formerly Ashburnham Add. exxxiii, now in the Huntington Library, California, as HM 744. Four other (interrelated) copies of the poem are in the same group of Oxford MSS which furnish our *ParlFoules* and *Black Knight* texts; and, as is the case with Lydgate's poem, the *Letter of Cupid* appears in Selden B 24 and in a Shirley MS, here the R 3, 20 volume of Trinity College, Cambridge. The text preserved by Durham Cathedral v. ii. 13, a Troilus MS, was not collated for the EETS edition nor is it mentioned by Skeat (*Oxford Chaucer* vii. 217 ff.). Some

collations of the Shirley MS, printed (with Ashburnham's) in the EETS Hoccleve i. 249 ff., and the variants offered by the two editors, permit us a limited opportunity to observe the treatment of Hoccleve here by his scribes.

Fairfax follows its usual habits as to omission and as to *e*-final. How far the former are shared by Bodley, and thus due to the man higher up, the editors do not give us to know; but, as compared with Ashburnham, Fairfax lacks these words: *moot* 28, *that* 44, 81, *ne* 62, *now* 66, *a* 67, *it* 72, *al* 83, *hy* 90, *as* 93, *they* 94, *for* 188, 374, *lo* 226. These omissions result in a headless line 44, 66, 72, 90, 94, in a broken-backed 62.

Fairfax persists in writing *hert*, although of his fifteen lines containing the word 256 is thus rendered clumsy and 47, 320 broken-backed. The writing *herte* appears four times. The adjective often lacks *-e*, as in the Chaucer-text above discussed; and this lack may throw the line into the headless or the broken-backed category. For the former, see *al* in 6, 419, *sharp* in 244, *soft* in 342, *first* in 351; for the latter, *al* in 156, *good* in 163, 365. So with verbs and adverbs; see the writing *fast* making line 60? headless, and lines 8, 31, 34, 385 becoming broken-backed or clumsy because of a falsely monosyllabic verb-form. Medial *-e* is omitted in 24, 167, 192, 344; but *wythouten* is written beside Bodley's *without* in 275, and the forms *ayens*, *betwex*, 87 and 221, both scan dissyllabic and fill the line. There is an occasional inorganic *-e*; cf. in especial *outwarde* beside *inward*, line 343, and *Gode wote*, line 364.

When these peculiarities are allowed for, some nine-syllabled lines remain.

Headless are:

	LINE
She mercye may / wol and purchace kan.	417
* Broken-backed? Deliberately short for effect?	
Ye do punyshment / and that anoon.	467
Skeat <i>punysshement</i> . So Ashburnham MS.	
Look ther be noon / excusacion.	471
Shirley and Selden insert <i>that</i> after <i>look</i> . Ashb. reads <i>looke</i> .	

Broken-backed are:

They ryght anoone / sterven in the place.	28
Shirley Selden, and Ashb. have <i>most</i> before <i>sterven</i> .	
And vnto hir / thank perpetuel.	76
Selden a <i>thank</i> , Shirley <i>hye thank</i> . Ashb. with Fairfax.	

But this I sey / verraly that she LINE
411
 Skeat adopts Ashburnham *we witen* instead of *I sey*, and the EETS editor inserts before *verraly* the word *right*—in no manuscript.

The tendency of Selden and Shirley to emend, still more marked in the *Black Knight*, may be less here because of the very small number of nine-syllabled lines. In 167 Selden's change of *wel* to *ful wel* indicates that he did not hear the following genitive *mennes* as dissyllabic; nor, apparently did Shirley, who ekes out the same line with *it*.

Hoccleve is often clumsy in arranging his accents, e.g., lines 66, 425. But when this poem was written (1402), he seems to have endeavored after the full ten syllables. That more clipped lines did not creep in accidentally by omission may be due to a shorter line of descent or to personal supervision of the archetype used by the Oxford-stem, a supervision not evident in the other two Fairfax texts here studied, the *Parlement of Foules* and the *Black Knight*.

We may turn next to Lydgate's *Complaint of the Black Knight*, in six hundred and eighty-one lines of rhyme royal, only eighteen lines shorter than the *ParlFoules*, and showing its influence. I have used for study the edition by Krausser in *Anglia* xix. 211-90, but have not always agreed with him regarding line-flow. Verses which I classify as he does are marked with a following K; but I have removed sixteen lines from his headless and eighteen from his broken-backed list. In some cases these are transferred to the other type. Skeat's print of the Thynne text of 1532 in the *Oxford Chaucer* vii. 245 ff. I have consulted for its citations of the manuscript-variants.

IIIa. HEADLESS LINES IN THE FAIRFAX 16 TEXT OF LYDGATE'S COMPLAINT OF THE BLACK KNIGHT

For to take the holsome lusty eyre	LINE 14K
Shirley <i>For unto</i> , etc., Selden <i>For to go</i> , etc.	
Grene laurer and the holsomme pyne	65K
Shirley <i>be grene</i> , etc., Selden . . . and <i>eke the</i> , etc.	
?And al therbes grovyng on the grounde	84
Other manuscripts <i>the erbes</i> .	
Oonly for he cam so nygh the welle	98K
But this welle that I her reherse	99K
Selden . . . <i>this ilke</i> , etc.	
Bollyn hertis and the venym perysh	101K
Kr. and Skeat <i>perce</i> , from D and Thynne. FTP <i>perysh</i> .	

	LINE
Gretly wondring what hit myght be.....	142K
Kr. <i>myght(e)</i> . Selden, Shirley, <i>what þat</i> , etc.	
Euery worde to marke what he sayed.....	153
Selden . . . <i>quhat þat he</i> , etc.	
Cause and rote of al such malady.....	189K
Selden <i>The cause . . . of suich a</i> , etc.	
Sey ryght noght as in conclusioun.....	198K
Shirley <i>Ne say</i> , etc., not taken by eds.; see Ia, line 207. Only F, Shirley, Selden, have <i>as</i> .	
*The salt teres that fro myn yen falle.....	223
Kr. <i>salt(e)</i> .	
Haue conspired ayens al ryght and lawe.....	258K
In 242, 253, Kr. expands to <i>ayen(e)s</i> , but not here.	
*Without mercy mordred Innocence.....	287
Kr. <i>Without(e)</i> . See 554 below.	
From his hest but hold that he hath hight.....	319K
Selden <i>behest</i> . See line 322.	
Throgh his knyghthode and (his) besy peyn.....	338K
Kr. takes <i>his</i> from other manuscripts.	
*He set periles thro his high provesse.....	348
Kr. <i>set(te)</i> . Other manuscripts <i>piler</i> s, not <i>periles</i> .	
Of Achilles or of Antonyas.....	367K
Had in love her lust and al her wille.....	377K
For al her falshede and grete vntrouthe.....	382
Kr. (<i>hir</i>) <i>grete</i> , etc., from Selden and Shirley. Skeat <i>hir</i> , from Selden.	
Athalans so feire of her visage.....	396
Stil port ne feythful attendaunce.....	409K
Kr. <i>Stil(le)</i> .	
Giltles God wote of al trespass.....	514
Kr. <i>Gilt(e)les</i> . Seld. and Shirley . . . of <i>al manere</i> , etc.; so Skeat.	
That ye goodly feir fressh and fre.....	544K
Kr. <i>feir(e)</i> .	
*Wythout gruching or rebellious.....	554
Kr. <i>Wythout(e)</i> . See 287 above.	
?What so euer she list with hem to do.....	560K
Esperus the goodly bryght sterre.....	612K
Kr. <i>bryght(e)</i> .	
For that ioy thou haddest when thou ley.....	621K
See Ia, line 49, and 644 below.	
Er fals Daunger sle hem and confounde.....	634
*The trew man that in the erber lay.....	637
Kr. <i>trew(e)</i> .	
*O glad sterre o lady Venus myn.....	639
Kr. <i>glad(de)</i> . Selden <i>goodly</i> .	

NINE-SYLLABLED LINE IN POST-CHAUCERIAN MANUSCRIPTS 141

For that love thou haddest to Adoun.....	LINE 644K
Selden . . <i>love þat thou</i> , etc. Note movement of 621 above.	
And when she was goon to her rest.....	645K
Selden . . <i>quhen þat . . gon unto</i> , etc. Skeat <i>And whan that</i> . . . <i>unto</i> .	
Preying thus in al my best entent.....	648
Selden . . <i>ryght thus</i> , etc. Skeat <i>Prayinge</i> , etc.	
*That al trew that be with daunger shent.....	649
Kr. <i>al(le) trew(e)</i> . See IIIId, line 638.	
Werred Trouthe with his tiranye.....	665K
Selden <i>Werreyed</i> , which Skeat takes.	
Fals Daunger to occupie his place.....	673K
Selden <i>for to</i> , etc.	
And my verry hertis souereigne.....	675K
Selden . <i>to my</i> , etc.	

We have here, in gross, thirty-seven headless lines, or three more than the Fairfax 16 scribe wrote in the *ParlFoules* text, of nearly the same length. But we have not here the same possibility of controlling omission, because there is no definite cleavage between manuscript-groups. Besides the Oxford codices and the allied copy in Pepys 2006, there are only Shirley and Selden available; and both these latter tinker the poem freely and independently, as a glance over the accompanying lists will show. Their insensitiveness to inflexional *-e* is evident from the fact that they have no recourse to it for emendation, but insert a monosyllable instead.

This one manuscript-stem from which we must draw our conclusions, the C-stem of the *ParlFoules*, has a marked tendency to omission and some deafness to the import of final *-e*. For the Chaucer-poem, the omissions are discussed in my paper;¹ its lines here cited can be in a measure controlled as regards the scribal dropping of words. We can see the probability of *how that* for *how* in line 9, of *There as* for *There* in 49, *Ther as that* for *Ther as* in 185; we can substitute *for to* in place of *to*, line 217, and read *yf that* for *yf* in 428, *as that* for *as* in 460. Also, we can feel the shortage of meaning in 53 and 544. Turning from Chaucer to this poem, we may conjecture *for that* in line 98, *for to* in line 626, *er that* in 634; but shortage of syntax or sense is not so easy to perceive elsewhere. The *her* of 382, the *right* of 648, the *for* of 673, are all plausible; but they are offered by scribes

¹ *University of Chicago Decennial Publications*, VII, 1-22.

who are so frankly emending in other places that we can feel no certainty. Allowing for omission in the three lines just mentioned, and for seven lines crippled at their opening by lack of *-e*, we have a much larger net number of headless lines here than in the *ParlFoules* text contained in the same manuscript and written by the same scribe from the same original. When we turn to the matter of broken-backed lines the difference is even greater.

IIIb. BROKEN-BACKED LINES IN THE FAIRFAX 16 TEXT OF LYDGATE'S *BLACK KNIGHT*

	LINE
And Hope also with saint John to borowe	12
Kr. <i>saint(e)</i> . Selden <i>Iohan</i> ; so Skeat.	
And with a sygh gan for to abreyde	15
Fairfax omits <i>I</i> before <i>gan</i> , breaking the line.	
*And for to splay out her leves on brede	33
Skeat <i>splaye(n)</i> . Digby <i>splaye</i> .	
That down to hem cast hys bemes clere	35K
No manuscript offers <i>unto</i> . Skeat <i>caste</i> .	
*And as me thoght that the nyghtyngale	47
Tanner <i>thoughte</i> .	
*With so grete myght her voys gan out wrest	48
Kr. <i>out(e)</i> . Tanner <i>mighte</i> , so Skeat.	
The soyl was pleyn smothe and wonder softe	50
In maner gan of her brethe delyte	61K
Skeat <i>gonnen</i> , from no manuscript or print. See line 579.	
The Cedres high vpryght as a lyne	67K
Selden <i>hye cidrice</i> .	
And mony a tre mo then I can telle	74
That ther vpon lustely gan s(pr)ying	81K
Shirley <i>so lustely</i> . Selden <i>full lustily</i> , etc. TDP end line <i>cam spryngyng</i> ; so Skeat.	
.The greyn of deth vpon ech brynk	90
Kr. <i>ech(e)</i> ; F has <i>eche</i> 662, <i>ech</i> 537. Selden <i>of cruell deth</i> ; Sh. <i>vpon eueryche a</i> , etc. Skeat takes Selden.	
So holsom was that hyt wolde aswage	100K
So drye a thrust thoght I wolde assay	107K
Selden <i>thoght þat I</i> , etc.	
To tast a draght of this welle or tweyn	108K
?And I gan about fast to beholde	121
Only F has <i>I</i> . Kr. <i>fast(e)</i> ; see 598, 617 below. Skeat <i>aboute faste</i> .	
Amyde of which stode an erber grene	125
Sh. <i>Amiddes</i> . TDPepys <i>of the which</i> . Skeat <i>whiche stood</i> .	

NINE-SYLLABLED LINE IN POST-CHAUCERIAN MANUSCRIPTS 143

	LINE
Hyt was a deth for to se him grone.....	140K
*That he so lay and had no felowe.....	143
Kr. <i>had(de)</i> . Sh. <i>hade per</i> . Skeat <i>hadde</i> .	
*Wherof I had routh and eke pite.....	145
Selden, Pepys, <i>gret routh</i> ; not taken by Skeat, who reads <i>hadde</i> .	
*For oon the best ther of brede and lengthe.....	162
And al the grounde of his woful chaunce.....	172K
Skeat writes <i>grounde</i> .	
Of pitouse wo and my honde eke quake.....	181K
And who that shal write to distresse.....	187K
Selden <i>And quoso that</i> , etc. Skeat <i>whoso</i> . See Ia, line 487.	
*This man compleyn with a pytouse soun.....	200
Selden <i>compleynynng</i> ; see 215 in list IIIc. Skeat <i>complayne</i> .	
*Yf eny such be here now present.....	210K
?To here this man be ful high sentence.....	213K
His mortal wo and his perturbaunce.....	214K
Selden <i>grete perturbance</i> ; taken by Skeat.	
*Theffect of which was as ye shal here.....	217K
Now colde as ise now as coles rede.....	234K
Selden <i>ise and now</i> , etc. Not taken by Skeat.	
*With al my myght feythfully to serue.....	247
With hert and al to be diligent.....	248K
Selden <i>for to be</i> , etc.; taken by Skeat.	
*And tonges fals throug her sleghtly wile.....	255
So that alas wrongfully he dyeth.....	265K
And entred ys into Trouthes londe.....	267K
For Cruelte satte in jugement.....	277K
Ther ys no geyn but he wil be wreke.....	284K
That lykly ar neuer for to sounde.....	292
Digby, Shirley, <i>to be sounde</i> . Sh. and S. read <i>beon</i> , not <i>ar</i> .	
Ayens whom helpe may no strife.....	356K
Kr. <i>Ayen(e)s</i> . See 533, 672 below.	
For al his trouth (ȝit) he lost his lyfe.....	357
Kr. takes <i>ȝit</i> from Selden. Sh. has . . <i>for loue he lost</i> , etc.	
*When that he went her in erthe lowe.....	359
Ywounded was thro Cupides bowe.....	361K
Selden, . . <i>owne bowe</i> . Not taken by Skeat.	
*Lo thus the fals ay in oon degre.....	376
?Of Thebes eke (loo) the fals Arcite.....	379
<i>loo</i> only in Shirley; Kr. brackets. Skeat supplies <i>knight</i> after <i>false</i> .	
And Demophon eke for his slouthe.....	380
Shirley, <i>his foule slouthe</i> . Kr. says, "analoges <i>ē</i> in <i>eke</i> ." Skeat alters and supplies.	

?For trwe Adon was slayn with the bore	LINE 386K
So lusty fre as of his corage	394K
Digby, . . and fre. Seld., <i>was of his</i> , etc. Skeat inserts <i>was</i> .	
But Love alas quyte him so his wage	397K
*Lo her the fyne of lovers seruise	400K
Skeat <i>lovers</i> . Shirley, . . <i>hys seruyce</i> .	
For feyth or othe worde ne assuraunce	407K
?Hungre ne thrust sorowe ne sekenesse	415K
*Accept ben now rathest vnto grace	427K
Skeat <i>Acceple</i> . Shirley <i>Accepted</i> .	
*And can hemself now best magnifie	428
Skeat <i>hemself</i> . Cf. <i>hymself</i> in 433.	
With feyned port and presumpcioun	429
Selden, and <i>false</i> , etc., which Skeat takes. But see 430.	
That safe the deth I no thing abide	439K
Shirley, . . <i>ellis abyde</i> .	
When euere hys dart that hym list to fyle	441K
*My woful hert for to ryve atwo	442
Shirley, . . <i>ryve al atwo</i> . Skeat <i>herte</i> .	
And most of al (ȝit) I me compleyn	447K
Kr. and Skeat take ȝit from Selden; Sh. has <i>ȝat</i> .	
Of this grete wrong I compleyn me	455
Kr. <i>compleyn(e)</i> ; so Skeat, also <i>wrongȝ</i> . Sh. <i>thus I</i> , etc.; Seld. <i>ȝat I now</i> , etc.	
To hurt his frende rathir then his foo	467K
So doth this god with his sharpe flon	468K
Skeat supplies <i>and</i> after <i>god</i> .	
Wnto his foo for to ben his leche	473
And herd hit ys for a man to seche	474K
Thus farith hit now euen by me	477
Selden <i>euenly</i> ; taken by Kr., not by Skeat.	
For now I se that ful longe aforne	486K
For they my dethe shopen or my shert	489K
Selden <i>haue shapen</i> ; not taken by eds.	
That vnder God hath the gouernaunce	492
And thus I am for my trouthe alas	512K
My lyve my deth stont in your grace	529K
Kr., Skeat, <i>stondeth</i> . Selden, <i>stont all in</i> , etc.	
And thogh my gilt be nothing alace	530K
For ther ayens shall I neuer strive	533
Skeat <i>ayeines</i> , Kr. <i>ayens</i> ; see 356 above. Shirley, <i>ne shal I</i> .	
*Yet er I dye with al my ful myght	542
Kr. <i>ful(le)</i> ; so Skeat.	
*But at her lust wilfully to dey	553
TD <i>luste</i> , so Skeat. Seld. . . <i>list to do me lyue or deye</i> .	

NINE-SYLLABLED LINE IN POST-CHAUCERIAN MANUSCRIPTS 145

	LINE
And alderlast to her womanhede.	561K
S. and Sh. <i>ento</i> ; so Skeat.	
That lye now here betwex hope and drede.	563K
Shirley <i>bytvene</i> . See Ib, line 148. FTP <i>betwext</i> .	
For vtterly this nys no demaunde.	565K
*In this mater more what myght I seyn.	568
*And fynally my hest holde I shall.	571
Kr. <i>hest(e)</i> .	
*The teres gan fro myn eyen reyn.	579K
Shirley <i>gonnen</i> ; Skeat <i>gonne</i> . See 61 above.	
*A penne I toke and gan me fast spede.	598
See 121, 617. Kr. <i>fast(e)</i> . Shirley, . . . to <i>spede</i> , etc.	
The woful pleynt of this man to write.	599
Selden <i>compleynt</i> . Skeat <i>playntē</i> .	
*If ought be mys leyth the wite on me.	603K
Skeat <i>layeth</i> . Shirley <i>ley ye</i> .	
Yf eny thing mysreported be.	605K
Sh. <i>amysse reported</i> . Skeat inserts <i>here after thing</i> .	
*Fer in the west lustely appere.	611
*And I as fast fel down on my kne.	617
So Kr.; TD <i>faste</i> , so Skeat. TDP <i>adoun</i> . See 121, 598 above.	
With Mars thi knyght whom Vulcanus founde.	622
FB <i>whom</i> ; eds. <i>when</i> . Selden <i>quhen þat</i> , etc. Only T has <i>yow</i> before <i>founde</i> , taken by eds.	
?At youre shame gan laughe and smyle.	626K
Selden <i>for to laugh</i> , taken by Skeat.	
And specially let thy myght be founde.	635K
What so yow list at good liberte.	661
Skeat <i>ye listē</i> .	
*For by my trouthe hit is ayens kynde.	672
Kr. <i>ayen(e)s</i> , Skeat <i>ayeines</i> . See 356 above.	
And be ryght glad for she shal the sene.	676K
Selden, <i>for þat she</i> , etc. Skeat puts semicolon after <i>glad</i> .	

IIIc. LINES EITHER HEADLESS OR BROKEN-BACKED, FAIRFAX 16 TEXT OF THE BLACK KNIGHT

	LINE
This erber was ful of floures (ynde).	127
Kr. <i>brokbd.</i> , Skeat <i>headless</i> .	
*Ther may no man ayein trouthe stryve.	159
Kr. <i>ayein(es)</i> . Selden <i>the treuth</i> , taken by Skeat.	
Compleynyng now lying in a traunce.	215
Tanner . . . <i>now and</i> , etc. Selden <i>Compleyne</i> ; see IIIb, line 200.	
Without ansuer while he was absent.	275
Selden <i>Withouten</i> . Skeat <i>answere</i> . F writes <i>insuer</i> .	

How may thou se thus in thy presence	LINE 286
Broken-backed in Krausser.	
And for al that was he sete behynde	353
Broken-backed in Krausser. Selden <i>that ȝit was he</i> , etc. Not taken by Skeat. See 357 of IIIb.	
And with these two eke the fals Ene	375
Broken-backed in Krausser.	
?Nature in her fully did emprise	502
Broken-backed in Krausser. Other MSS <i>did in her fully</i> , etc. Sh. <i>did fully in her persone</i> , etc.	
*When that her list fro my body wynde	573
Tanner <i>liste</i> ; so Skeat.	
*Lyke as his hert ryve wolde atweyne	576
Seld. <i>wold ryve</i> , Shirley <i>wolde to ryven</i> , etc. Skeat <i>herte</i> .	
Let not this man for his trouthe dey	620
Broken-backed in Krausser.	
For to socour what so that thou may	636

III*d*. LINES BOTH HEADLESS AND BROKEN-BACKED, FAIRFAX 16 TEXT OF THE *BLACK KNIGHT*

For him set last vpon a daunce	LINE 355
Kr. <i>For (he)</i> etc.; <i>he</i> only in Shirley. Skeat supplies <i>he</i> independently. Selden <i>at þe laste</i> , etc. Skeat <i>sette</i> .	
*And al trew further for his sake	638
Kr. <i>al(le) trew(e)</i> . See III <i>a</i> , line 649.	
*Your trew man may summe mercie fynde	669
Kr. <i>trew(e)</i> ; so Skeat. Kr. broken-backed. Selden <i>That your</i> , etc.	

The two scribes Selden and Shirley frequently fill out lines of their original; and Skeat, who is more anxious than Krausser to eliminate nine-syllabled lines, takes a larger proportion of these readings; see Krausser in lines 62, 86, 216, 357, 360, 382, 391, 411, 447, 546, 547. Skeat, not Krausser, follows Selden in 90, 159, 214, 242, 248, 429, 514, 561, 626, 645, 665, 673; but he refuses Selden in 67, 80, 88, 145, 182, 234, 275, 292, 353, 361, 455, 477, 489, 499, 529, 533, 599, 646, 648, 669, 675. The Shirley manuscript's separate readings are not used by Skeat, who, however, agrees with it in his emendation of 355, 541, coining something different in 379, 380, 605. Krausser rejects its readings in 143, 198, 241, 380, 541, 598, 603.

Some of the short lines repaired by Selden and by Shirley, such as 391, must represent omissions by the ancestor; and there are a number in Fairfax itself or in FB, viz., *I* 15; *my* 20; *the* 30, 71; *pure* 94; *had* 106;

ful 135; *now colde* 233; *his* 338; *he* 395; *thes* 371; *in* 475; *cause* 640; *be* 670. In the small remaining fragment of the Bodley text, Fairfax's omissions of *yow* 622, *to* 666, and *him* 671 are shared; and Tanner shares F's lack of *lovers*, line 7.

The inflexional syllable has the same inaccurate handling as in the *ParlFoules*. Looking over the bracketed *e*'s introduced by Krausser into his text, we note twenty-seven cases of the weak or the plural adjective, eight of a substantive in the dative, twelve of verb-forms, eleven of adverbs. There is the same inconsistency in the use of *-e*; *hert* is written seven times, five of these to the injury of the line-flow; *hert* is written PoFoules 355, 660, where Bodley has *herte*, but both manuscripts spell *hert* PoFoules 417, *herte*, *ibid.*, line 425. Inorganic *-e* is sometimes written by Fairfax; cf. *mortalle* PoFoules 73, or *ywyse* line 697 of that poem, where Bodley writes *Iwis*.

The difference, as regards nine-syllabled lines, between Chaucer, Hoccleve, and Lydgate, is very marked in these Fairfax transcriptions. There is a constant Fairfax or "Oxford" element of omission and of *e*-mishandling; but when that has been allowed for, the difference still remains. It can hardly be argued that a manuscript-tree which hands us the *Letter of Cupid* with so few nine-syllabled lines would crowd them into the *Black Knight*; their lavish use by Lydgate himself, in the latter poem, is more probable. Yet it does not follow that a similarly high percentage of broken-backed lines is to be expected in any and every poem by Lydgate; nor, so far as my study has gone, do I find this ratio invariable. According to Prosiegel's analysis of the *Secrees*, presumably Lydgate's last piece of work, they amount there to 10 per cent, and the headless lines to about 15 per cent, of the total; and in the Prologue to the *Fall of Princes* the broken-backed verses are much less numerous than are the acephalous. I have, however, only a very small basis of comparison for this statement, only the Royal 18 D iv text to put beside the Bodley 263 as printed by Dr. Bergen. For the *Dance Macabre* I have classified the manuscripts, but as I lack a copy of the Ellesmere, probably the senior text of the earlier or Lydgatian recension, it is hard to recognize omission with the definiteness which the Ashburnham makes possible for the *Letter of Cupid* or the presence of the A-group for the *Parlement of Foules*.

For all of Lydgate's work there is yet available very little material making technical study possible. It requires a full apparatus of variants, at least, to show the idiosyncrasies of the separate scribes, the allowance which must be made, as here, for the omissions of "Oxford," for the *e*-indifference of Fairfax, for the constant meddling of Selden or of Shirley. Rarely have we, in the fifteenth century, a piece of work in which a critical theory of verse and strict scribal fidelity have joined forces. But such a text exists in the next poem we consider.

IV. THE PALLADIUS-TEXT OF THE WENTWORTH WODEHOUSE MS

Contemporary, it is probable, with Lydgate's translation of the *Fall of Princes*, there was executed for Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, patron of Lydgate's work, a translation of Palladius *De re rustica*, also in rhyme royal. This seems to have been made under Gloucester's immediate personal supervision; the unknown translator says in his prologue that Humphrey taught him "metring," and in the various linking stanzas of the separate books he speaks of the duke's own scrutiny and correction of his work. Two copies of the poem, at Wentworth Wodehouse and in the Bodleian, closely related to each other, are very probably transcribed from Humphrey's own copy, as the former manuscript, printed by Liddell in 1896, reproduces the arms of Humphrey in its opening initial. So excellent is the text of Wentworth Wodehouse that its editor, Mark H. Liddell, rarely has to supply a missing word from Bodley Add. A 369 (formerly at Colchester Castle); and in the first 1,800 lines I note but three cases in which the scribe shows carelessness about inflexional *-e*: *-fen(e)stellis* in i. 534, *wort(e)-wormys* in i. 880 and *first(e) book* in i. 1170. The iambic flow is completely orthodox; I have not observed any nine-syllabled lines; and in the metrical workmanship one is obliged to recognize not only a very conscious and competent manipulator of rhythm, but a strict scribal supervision by men who heard the *-e* and insisted that it be duly written. The matter of the book is exceedingly unpoetic; but the man behind it was both accurate and able; he twists his verse with a firm hand, varies his pauses and his line-length agreeably, and whenever he has a chance to speak for himself presents the reader with brief *tours de force* in word-play and rhyme-pattern which are as much

superior technically to Lydgate's envoys on three rhymes or his use of refrain as the Palladius' line-management is superior to Lydgate's monotony.

The existence of such a piece of work as this in the second quarter of the fifteenth century is of great importance in studying post-Chaucerian metrics. Moreover, it shows not only that a linguistic standard had not yet disappeared, but that it had certainly existed; it throws back light on Chaucer. We may speculate with interest on Duke Humphrey's opinion of Lydgate's metrical work as compared with this; but we can only speculate. What we can say with certainty is that theory and care were both necessary to produce a text so free of *e*-mismanagement and of nine-syllabled lines. Author and scribe must agree. If one deviates positively or the other negatively, there will arise the varying results which we see in fifteenth-century manuscripts.

A succession of careful copyists, even after the author's supervision was removed, might long preserve a fourteenth-century text intact except for accidental omissions and for the probable growing insensitiveness to *e*-final. And among the many manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales* there must be such, may be even manuscripts affected by Chaucer's own supervision. From the eight codices as yet published, I select the *Second Nun's Tale* as transcribed by Ellesmere and by Corpus.

V. CHAUCER'S *SECOND NUN'S TALE* AS IN THE ELLESMERE AND THE CORPUS CHRISTI MSS

a) In the Ellesmere copy of the *Tale*, 553 lines rhyme royal, there are a very few lines awkward by omission. One of the most marked of these errors is:

Thee meene I / mayde and mooder Cecilie 28

where the *seinte* of six manuscripts is omitted by Ellesmere and by Harley 7334, the Ellesmere also writing *mooder* for *martir*. The verse is thus headless in Ellesmere, by error. Omission of *it* also makes the line halt in:

Ye make vs gilty / and is nat sooth 451

Headless lines are:

First wolde I / the name of seinte Cecile 85

Seven other manuscripts . . . *wolde I yow*, etc.

And if he / may feelen out of drede.....	LINE 155
Six manuscripts <i>And if that he</i> , etc. Harley omits line.	
So / in beyng of diuinitee.....	340
Other manuscripts <i>So in oo beyng</i> , etc.	
Thre persones / may ther right wel bee.....	341
Headless in eight manuscripts.	
What maner womman / artow quod he.....	424
So four other manuscripts; CorpusPetwLansd. read . . <i>artow þo quod he</i> , which Skeat takes.	
Broken-backed lines are:	
Kepeth ay wel / thise corones three.....	226
Here the error of Ellesm. and Harl. 7334, in writing <i>three</i> for <i>quod he</i> , breaks the line. Cf. <i>prestes thre</i> of the Gen Prol., 164.	
The Aungel of God / hath me trouthe ytaught.....	267
Omission of <i>the before trouthe</i> , by the same two manuscripts.	
Is verray god / this is oure sentence.....	418
So the Gg MS; the other six write . . <i>is al oure</i> , etc.	
She sat al coold / and feeled no wo.....	521
So Hengwrt; Gg <i>felede</i> , Dd <i>feled</i> . CorpusPL . . <i>and felt of it no woo</i> ; Harley . . <i>and felle of no woo</i> .	

Thrice in the *Tale* a mistreatment of medial *-e* by these manuscripts causes a clumsy line. The writing of *crisned* by EllHengCorpus in 217, of *tormentours* by EllHeng in 373, 376, clip the line in each case. All three times Harley and Gg write the *-e*.

Ellesmere writes a six-beat line in 510; other manuscripts have not his *ne*.

b) In the Corpus Christi copy of the same *Tale* there are many more frequent and more flagrant errors than in Ellesmere. It lacks several lines; it twice fuses two lines; it has a number of lines overlong; it omits often. Its omissions make the line headless in 52, 109, 113, 311, 450; the same fault breaks the verse in 168 (Gg also), 169?, and 535. But except for line 341, which it shares with the seven other published manuscripts, the Corpus has here no nine-syllabled verse not due to omission.

Some of its readings are important, not only 424 and 521 as above, and the differences from Ellesmere, etc., in 122, 483, but the following:

He fond þis holy Vrban þer anon	185
So CorpusPL. Ellesmere, etc., <i>He foond this hooly / olde Vrban anon</i> . Skeat adopts Ellesmere. The double sound-echo in Ell may raise the question if Chaucer wrote both line-forms, and if so, why he altered one.	

..... dede him so tobete	LINE 405
So CorpusPL and Dd. Ellesmere, etc., omit <i>to</i> .	
..... hire heryng place	409
So CorpusPL. Ellesmere, etc., <i>hire burying place</i> , which Skeat takes.	
In view of the early Christian practice of burying martyrs under the altar, is not Corpus an important reading?	

However careless the Corpus Christi scribe at times, he has in this *Tale* no more nine-syllabled lines caused by omission than has Ellesmere, and no more need of emendation as regards *e*-final. He seems to have been in possession of a good archetype, and to have followed it for the most part obediently; but he was subject to lapses in which he injured his work so as to require extensive erasure and re-writing, a revision which was never carried out. He is quite a different personality from Lansdowne, who is a negligent hack-workman without ear and with but half an eye for his task, a man with no notion of spelling and no desire for accuracy. I might identify Corpus with Adam, did I wish to make the identification; but neither Ellesmere nor Lansdowne could be so identified. Corpus' original was good enough to have been Chaucer's own, his *e*-management careful enough to be due to Chaucer's admonition; his occasional maltreatment of his text is bad enough to have merited Chaucer's despairing censure.

Looking over these few facts, we recognize that for each text must be reckoned the author's theory of verse, the scribe's individual tendency to conscious or unconscious deviation, and the possible force of supervision. The Palladius-transcript is clearly the outcome of well-defined theory and well-enforced practice; the two Chaucer-extracts are of the same doubly armored type, injured in the case of Corpus by occasional heedlessness. The Fairfax is soberly attentive to its original, but with marked, though unconscious, tendency to err by omission and by deafness to *-e*, errors which run all through its group; the Oxford group as a whole shows no such supervision as does the Palladius. The Shirley and the Selden codices were written by men who were reading their texts in the large, not word by word, as does the professional copyist—men who objected in theory to the nine-syllabled line and who had no scruples, in practice, against emending it. Their supervision is as obvious as that exercised over the Palladius-scribe, but to a different end.

And when these scribal personalities are disengaged from their texts, we find the *Second Nun's Tale* and *Palladius* with the minimum of nine-syllabled lines or none; we find the *Parlement of Foules* with more of them than the mechanically syllable-counting Hoccleve admits; and we find the *Black Knight* teeming with them.

If the individuality of the author is to count for anything, I would explain both Hoccleve's freedom and Lydgate's obsession through their respective temperaments. Hoccleve, though deficient in any real rhythmic sense, holds steadily to the full pentameter line; Lydgate has somewhat more of rhythm, but shows his limitations in his repeating of a few types, his inability to vary line-flow. That he was a creature of repetition his vocabulary and style, his recurrent padding phrases and overworked descriptive formulas, amply prove. What Chaucer used as a metrical variant Lydgate erected into a type; Chaucer's "easements" become Lydgate's "staples," to borrow terms from Professor Saintsbury. He is not the only disciple who has exaggerated his master's teaching; Swinburne himself takes a line-form used occasionally by Shelley, oftener by Hugo, and in *Tristram of Lyonesse* makes it a mannerism.

Lydgate's mass of nine-syllabled lines may have developed thus. I cannot see that they are due, in his work, to the fall of inflexional -e; and neither his association with monastic chanting nor the survival of alliterative line-cleavage accounts for the appearance in him alone of all these broken-backed verses. Other men in the fifteenth century, especially later in the period, wrote actual doggerel, neither nine-syllabled, ten-syllabled, nor rhythmic, conscious only of an approaching rhyme-word. Their ineptitude is unsystematized; he is systematically inept. His persistently short-breathed phrasing, like his fishing-rod paragraphs, is the reflection of his mentality. It is a mentality which often seems hardly worth the student's candle; but through study of it there must come light on the whole period, and on Chaucer.

ELEANOR PRESCOTT HAMMOND

BOSTON, MASS.

THE FIRST SIX DECADES OF FRENCH SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY COMEDY

L'histoire de la comédie en France n'est pas, comme celle du drame sérieux, coupée en deux par la Renaissance ... l'histoire de la comédie est une, et la tradition du genre se suit et se développe, ininterrompue depuis six siècles, sans brusques révolutions.¹

This assertion is almost universally accepted by historians of French comedy.

Since the farce was the only type of the ancient *drame comique* which persisted to any considerable extent through the seventeenth century,² it must be the farce whose "history is one and uninterrupted" throughout this long period. Such is, in fact, the general contention. The farce is the thread which leads from the somewhat murky labyrinth of the *esprit gaulois* into the light of the comedy of Molière. It is the purpose of this sketch to trace the development of comedy in Paris through the first sixty years of the seventeenth century in order to raise some questions as to the validity of this point of view.

It is certain that the farce formed a very essential and a very attractive part of the programs given on the stage of the Hôtel de Bourgogne³ during the first thirty-odd years of the century. During this time the theater existed for the people and hence was very much of the people. But during the decade from 1630 to 1640 it was transformed into a place of at least demi-respectability and, in consequence, adopted as a more and more attractive diversion by the *beau monde*. For the first five years of this decade the farce continued to flourish, maintained by the talents of those consummate *farceurs*, Gautier Garguille, Gros Guillaume, and Turlupin. When these three worthies died in 1633, 1634, 1635, respectively, the farce declined rapidly in favor.

¹ Petit de Julleville, *Histoire de la Langue et de la Littérature française*, II (Paris, 1896), 421.

² The *Sottie* was abolished for political reasons (Petit de Julleville, *op. cit.*, p. 432), and the *Moralité* gave way to the tragi-comedy (see Rigal, *Le Théâtre avant la période classique* [Paris, 1901], p. 138).

³ Rigal, *op. cit.*, pp. 136 f.

The famous *Déclaration au sujet des Comédiens* of Louis XIII, dated April 16, 1641, was undoubtedly issued in response to this change in the taste of the theater-going public. By this edict, "All actors are forbidden . . . to represent unseemly actions," or to use any "lascivious or ambiguous expressions" which might "offend the public taste." Those who failed to comply with these prescriptions were to be declared "infamous," and judges were instructed to inflict upon them penalties which were not to exceed "fines and banishment."¹ That same year Guillot Gorju, an understudy of Gros Guillaume, left the company of the Hôtel de Bourgogne. Sauval accompanies the statement of the fact with the terse remark: "*Quand il descendit du théâtre, la farce en descendit avec lui.*"² While this statement must not be taken too literally, there is no lack of evidence that, from this date on, the farce lost rapidly the favored position it had so long held on the public stages of Paris, and was relegated more and more to the *baragues* of the Foire and the *tréteaux* of Le Pont Neuf.

During these thirty to forty years while the farce flourished, it showed no development and won no favor as a literary *genre*. None of the contemporaries of Hardy, Rotrou, and Corneille show the slightest tendency to confuse it with comedy, although they confuse tragedy and tragi-comedy, tragi-comedy and comedy, with great industry.³ That illustrious *farceur*, Bruscambille, plainly cherished no illusions about the nature of his offerings when he declared from the stage of the Hôtel de Bourgogne:

Reste la dernière objection de nos destructeurs qui disent que ... nos représentations tragiques et comiques sembleroient tolérables; mais *une farce garnie de mots de gueule* gâte tout, et que d'une pluye contagieuse elle pourrit nos plus belles fleurs. Ah! Vrayment pour ce regard, *je passe condamnation: mais à qui en est la faute?*⁴

A decree of Parliament, dated March 22, 1633, is directed against a troupe of actors who *exercent et jouent comédies et farces*.⁵ The year following, Renaudot, reporting in his *Gazette* the festivities of a wedding celebration, relates that *entre la comédie et La Farce, il y eut un concert*

¹ Cited by Parfaict, *Histoire du Théâtre français*, VI (Paris, 1745), 131 ff.

² Cited by Parfaict, *op. cit.*, V, 93.

³ For example, the story of *The Matron of Ephesus* (1614?) is dramatized and styled a tragi-comedy. See Parfaict, *op. cit.*, IV, 188.

⁴ Cited by Rigal, *Alexandre Hardy* (Paris, 1899), p. 156.

⁵ Cited by Parfaict, *op. cit.*, V, 50 f. n.

merveilleux ... ceste Farce étoit excellente.¹ In this case the *comédie* in question was the *Mélite* of Corneille.

Our modern tendency to subordinate form to content, aesthetic ideas to moral notions, has undoubtedly led us into much confusion on this point. When Jean de la Taille declared in the Preface to *Les Corrivaux* (1573): *Vous y verrez, non point une Farce ni une moralité ... vous y verrez une comédie faicte au patron, à la mode et au portraict des anciens Grecs et Latins*, he felt very clearly the distinction between these two comic genres. It is quite beside the mark to say, as Fournel and many others have done: "*Ces vieilles comédies ne sont autre chose que des farces souvent grossières*."² The fact that these "old comedies" or, for that matter, any comedies are as licentious, as *grossières* even in moral tone as the farce, has little to do with the case. The doctrinaires and poets of the Renaissance felt strongly that it is chiefly a question of form. A droll story, presented baldly as a comic episode, without conscious attempt at social and moral portrayal is a farce. The same droll story furnished with concomitant episodes which now hasten, now retard the dénouement, with auxiliary characters so chosen that they present a tolerably complete social and moral milieu, is a comedy. The one is a non-literary genre, by universal acceptance raw and crude, the other a work of art with almost unlimited possibilities of development.

This idea of comedy as a literary genre was clearly formulated for the first time in France by the adepts of the Renaissance. Jacques Peletier du Mans in his *Art Poétique* of 1555, for example, gave a definition which was to be repeated in but slightly different words by both Corneille and Molière. He says:

La comédie a été dite le miroir de la vie parce qu'en elle s'introduisent des personnes populaires; desquelles il faut garder la bienséance selon la condition et état de chacune.³

To be sure he proceeds forthwith to spoil the effect of this excellently stated or faithfully repeated formula by giving a list of comic themes which are taken, not from life as he saw it, but from his readings in

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 73.

² Fournel, *Les contemporains de Molière* (Paris, 1863), p. 21.

³ Cited by Pierre Toldo, *Revue d'Histoire littéraire*, IV (1897), 383 f.

Plautus and Terence or some of their learned commentators. These themes are:

L'avarice ou la prudence des vieillards, les amours et ardeurs des jeunes enfants des maisons; les astuces et ruses de leurs amies; la vilenie et deshonnêteté des maquereaux; la façon tantôt sévère, tantôt facile; l'assentiment et vilenie des parasites: la vanterie et braveté d'un soudart retiré de la guerre; la diligence des nourrices; l'indigence des mères.¹

The poets of the Renaissance, by following too literally this program, ruined whatever chances the new *genre* might have had for the moment of establishing itself in the popular favor. In spite of occasional adaptations of Plautus and Terence comedies, in spite of occasional appropriations of certain comic types like the braggart captain, the nurse, and the valet, the erudite comedy of the Renaissance exerted little influence upon the *genre* which was to be brought forth upon the stages of the Hôtel de Bourgogne and of the Théâtre du Marais.

According to the Parfaicts, whose classifications and dates, while notoriously inaccurate for this period, may serve as a rough indication, there were produced during the decade from 1601 to 1610, 27 tragedies, 7 tragi-comedies, 4 pastorals, and *no comedies*; from 1611 to 1620, 21 tragedies, 8 tragi-comedies, 6 pastorals, and *8 comedies*; from 1621 to 1630, 11 tragedies, 16 tragi-comedies, 14 pastorals, and *5 comedies*; from 1631 to 1640, 49 tragedies, 65 tragi-comedies, 5 pastorals, and *29 comedies*; from 1641 to 1650, i.e., the great period of Corneille, 61 tragedies, 45 tragi-comedies, 2 pastorals, and *32 comedies*; from 1651 to 1660, 23 tragedies, 19 tragi-comedies, 2 pastorals, and *36 comedies*.

During the first three decades of the century the process of constructing plays remained about the same. "*C'étoit faire une comédie que de mettre en vers une vie de Plutarque*," says Guéret in his *Parnasse Réformé*.² Segrais is even more explicit:

Pendant plus de quarante ans, on a tiré presque tous les sujets de pièces de théâtre de l'*Astrée*, et les poètes se contentoient ordinairement de mettre en vers ce que M. d'Urfé y fait dire en prose aux personnages de son Roman.³

This method, as a matter of fact, remained long in vogue although the authors soon became somewhat more eclectic in their choice of sources.

¹ *Loc. cit.*

² Paris, 1669, p. 58.

³ Cited by Rigal, *Alexandre Hardy*, p. 504.

But the few comedies which are said to have been produced during this period seem, for the most part, to have formed an exception. The three by Larivey are, of course, merely adaptations of the Italian *Commedia Erudita*. The two by Troterel and the anonymous *Les Ramoneurs* offer much resemblance to the Renaissance comedies of Jodelle and Grévin. The *Comédie des Proverbes* was a *tour de force*; its characters speak continually in proverbs and its plot seems to have been taken from the Italian comedy. The title of another, about which we know nothing except the title, suggests a *Commedia dell' Arte* sketch. Of the three or four others cited by the Parfaicts two at least seem to have been played at a later date, and another is the *Mélite* of Corneille, played in 1629 or 1630.¹ This play which all the contemporaries, including Corneille himself, regarded as a new *genre*, was composed according to the current formula. A number of plot and character elements are taken from previous plays and current novels and combined into a dramatic representation.

Corneille himself alleges that when he wrote it he knew nothing of the "rules" of dramatic composition, that he had to guide him only "a little common sense and the example of the late Hardy."² Since he was not disposed to write a tragedy, it is evident that he must have sought his *exemple* either in Hardy's tragi-comedies or in his pastorals. Rigal has characterized the former as *des nouvelles dramatisées* and the latter as *des comédies bourgeoises et sérieuses, agrémentées d'incidents comiques ou merveilleux*.³ This *merveilleux*, in the pastorals of Hardy at least, was about the only feature that prevented them from being regarded as pure comedies. It consisted in apparitions of Venus, of Cupid, of Pan, and of Satyrs whose misadventures furnished the greater part of the *agrément comiques*. One would expect to find in these pastorals the *exemple* which Corneille tried to follow in the composition of the *Mélite*.

But, as a matter of fact, G. L. Van Roosbroeck⁴ finds that while the characters of *Mélite* show some traces of pastoral influence, the details of the plot are more closely akin to two of Hardy's tragi-comedies. The one, *Gésippe*, is a dramatized Boccaccian *novella*, the other,

¹ See H. Carrington Lancaster, *Modern Language Notes*, XXX (1915), 1 ff.

² P. Corneille, *Œuvres*, I (Paris, 1862), 137.

³ Alexandre Hardy, pp. 503 and 537, respectively.

⁴ *The Genesis of Corneille's Mélite*. Vinton, Iowa: Kruse Publishing Co.

Dorize, is a dramatization of one of the *Histoires des Amants volages de ce temps*, by François Rosset, Paris, 1619. This last was, in fact, *une pièce d'actualité*, for which, dramatized, the comedy was the only form *qui paraisse raisonnable*, according to Rigal.¹ In both *Dorize* and *Mélite*, two lovers go mad, then recover their senses, and both plays end in a double marriage. Why, then, is Corneille's play a comedy while Hardy's is a tragi-comedy? Perhaps because in Hardy's play there is an episode of a magic charm, while in Corneille's comedy things are brought about by purely natural causes. At any rate, it is not easy to find a more convincing reason. A play in which there was only threatened violence and no supernatural elements, with characters which, while quite lovelorn, are not shepherds and shepherdesses, may seem to Corneille to have deserved a new name, and he called his play a comedy. It was doubtless to the elimination of these elements of unreality that he applied something of that common sense of which he speaks in the *Examen*. And it was without doubt the absence of these elements as well as of the traditional comic character types that enabled Corneille, some thirty years later, to dwell with such complacency upon the *nouveauté de ce genre de comédie dont il n'y a point d'exemple en aucune langue*.²

La Veuve, played some three years later, seems to have established for the moment Corneille's reputation as a writer of comedy. In verses written for the first edition of the play, in 1634, Mairet hails his future rival, and fixes the character of his work:

Rare écrivain de notre France,
Qui le premier des beaux esprits
A fait revivre en tes écrits
L'esprit de Plaute et de Térence.

Rotrou, in the same connection, declared that the charms of the heroines in other popular pastorals of the period had paled before those of Corneille's widow,³ and other poets voice the same conviction.

Corneille's *Épître au Lecteur* in this first edition of *La Veuve* offers some evidence that he had, in the meantime, been exposed at least to the received academic notions of what comedy should be. At any rate,

¹ *Op. cit.* pp. 481 ff.

² *Op. cit.*, I, 138.

³ Corneille, *Œuvres*, I, 380 ff. Rotrou's statement seems to justify the remark attributed to Tristan by Segrais: "*Ces pièces-là s'appeloient des Pastorales auxquelles les comédies succédèrent.*" Cited by Rigal, *op. cit.*, p. 504.

he gives a definition of the *genre* which is wholly in accord with that of Peletier du Mans, formulated some eighty years before, and which will be repeated in practically the same terms by Molière some thirty years later. "*La comédie*," he says, "*n'est qu'un portrait de nos actions et de nos discours, et la perfection des portraits consiste en la ressemblance.*" He insists that he has put in practice the spirit of that definition:

Sur cette maxime, je tâche de ne mettre en la bouche de mes acteurs que ce que diroient probablement en leur place ceux qu'ils représentent, et de les faire discourir en honnêtes gens, et non pas en auteurs.¹

But this is the language of a Preface. From the modern point of view at least, he flatly contradicts himself a few lines farther down in the same paragraph. Speaking of his pairs of lovers, he concludes: "*Le plus beau de leurs entretiens est en équivoques, et en propositions dont ils te laissent les conséquences à tirer.*" That is to say, the characters, if they do not talk "like authors," do talk like the heroes and heroines of the then-current fiction, and that is precisely the way it appeals to the valet Géron in the play, who says of his master:

S'il savoit mieux dire, il diroit autrement;
Il dit ce qu'il a lu.²

In this play a duel looms twice, although not very imminently, and there is a tragi-comic abduction. In it, too, the lovers practice with great fluency, *l'anatomie du cœur amoureux*, as Mlle de Scudéry was to aptly phrase it. In short, *La Veuve* is a play in which the course of true love is somewhat less precipitous than in the tragi-comedy, and, thanks to the choice of characters, a little less artificially presented than in the pastorals.

Almost all of the contemporary poets who contributed poetical tributes for the first edition of the play stress this love-fiction element. Mairet declares that Corneille has "revived the wit of Plautus and Terence":

Sans rien dérober des douceurs
De Mélipe ni de ses sœurs [I, 380].

It is difficult to connect with the idea of comedy the following verses of Corneille's quite unknown admirer, Guérente:

Corneille, que ta *Veuve* a des charmes puissants!
Ses yeux remplis d'amour, ses discours innocents

¹ *Œuvres*, I, 377.

² Vss. 264 and 265 of *La Veuve*, Act I, scene iv; *Œuvres*, I, 412.

Jointes à sa majesté plus divine qu'humaine,
Paraissent au théâtre avec tant de splendeur, etc. ...
Mais ce n'est pas assez: sa parlante peinture
A tant de ressemblance avecque la nature
Qu'en lisant tes écrits l'on croit voir des amants
Dont la mourante voix naïvement propose
Ou l'extrême bonheur ou les rudes tourments
Qui furent le sujet de leur métamorphose [I, 380].

Another contributor speaks of

Faire régner l'amour, accroître son empire,
Peindre avec tant d'adresse un gracieux martyr [ibid., p. 387].

And still another:

Incomparable Veuve, ornement de ce temps,
Tu vas mettre du trouble et du feu dans les âmes
Faisant moins d'ennemis que de cœurs inconstants [ibid., p. 393].

With all allowances made for exaggerated expression, it is evident that Corneille's contemporaries were impressed chiefly by its representation of love, not in the sensual fashion of the Latin and Italian comedy, but in the highly idealized form of the current novels. Desmarests de Saint-Sorlin at least proclaims this contemporary attitude through one of his characters in *Les Visionnaires*, played in 1637. All the characters of this dramatized satire are extreme caricatures of absurd contemporary social types. Sestiane is the young woman in the play who is infatuated with *la comédie*. In his Preface the poet asserts that she, in common with the other characters, is a true representative of what was being thought and felt, though perhaps not always said, in mundane circles. In the third scene of the second act it occurs to Sestiane that Phalante, *le riche imaginaire*, would be an excellent type to insert in a comedy. She concludes:

Il n'y faudroit qu'y coudre un morceau de roman
Ou trouver dans l'histoire un bel événement
Pour rendre de tout point cette pièce remplie
Afin qu'elle eût l'honneur de paroître accomplie.¹

When her sister replies that it would be better for the "honor of the French stage" to prepare a piece which would represent in one day all the deeds of Alexander the Great, Sestiane retorts: "Vous verriez cent combats avec trop peu d'amour." In discussing the comic

¹ *Théâtre François, ou Recueil des meilleures Pièces de Théâtre*, VII (Paris, 1837), 138.

possibilities inherent in the resemblance of twin brothers who are so beautiful that they will give rise every day to *quelque intrigue agréable*, Sestiane adds:

Cet acte seroit plein de plaisantes erreurs:

Même on y peut mêler quelques *douces fureurs* [*ibid.*, p. 201].

It is clear that for Sestiane, and, by extension, with all proportions duly observed, for the class which she represents, an idealized love story was the all-important element in a comedy. It was this feature that persisted in the memory of Corneille when he was writing the *Examen* of *Mélite*, around 1660:

Ce mariage a si peu d'apparence, qu'il est aisé de voir qu'on ne le propose que pour satisfaire à la coutume de ce temps-là, qui étoit de marier tout ce qu'on introduisoit sur la scène.¹

But it was a love story which had little in common with the sensual passion of classic comedy and nothing at all in common with the *grossièretés* of the farce. Nor was it an importation from modern foreign comedy, but a conception which grew up in response to the social ideals and tastes of the period.

Other writers of the period treated this love element with less idealism, as, for example, Mairet in *Les Galanteries du Duc d'Ossone* (1632) and Mareschal in *Le Railleur* (1638). In the Preface to the first edition of *La Suivante*, in 1637, Corneille seems to have modified somewhat his conception of the *genre* when he asserts: "*Les fourbes et les intrigues sont principalement du jeu de la comédie, les passions n'y entrent que par accident.*"² The adventure of the *Cid* and his great successes in tragedy which followed diverted him for a time from the cultivation of this idea. But it points straight to the *Menteur*, played some seven years later. In his *Examen* to this comedy Corneille no longer prides himself upon *ce stile familier*, but rather upon the "ingeniousness" of the plot and its attendant comic situations.³ Ingeniousness in plot complication is one of the outstanding features of French comedy from *Le Menteur* to the comedy of Molière.

The success of *Le Menteur* also contributed to encourage another practice which Corneille had followed, but by no means inaugurated, in composing this play, namely, the appropriation of plots from Span-

¹ *Œuvres*, I, 140.

² *Ibid.*, II, 118.

³ *Ibid.*, IV, 137.

ish playwrights. After *Le Menteur*, probably nine-tenths of the comedy plots are taken from Spanish plays. This is not the place to take up the question of Spanish influence about which so much has been written. But, in passing, the question may be raised: Does the mere utilization of a plot constitute, properly speaking, an "influence"? One gets the impression, when reading the arguments of French comedies following *Le Menteur*, that the authors have simply found it more convenient to take a plot which has already been fashioned to the stage than to extract one themselves from the prolix novels which served as sources.

De la Martinière, in his essay on Scarron,¹ touches upon this point:

La mode de ce temps étoit de piller les poètes Espagnols: Scarron sçavoit cette langue, il lui étoit plus facile de moissonner dans un champ, où il trouvoit déjà tout préparé, que de se rompre la tête à inventer un sujet, et ensuite à le mettre dans la règle des trois unités.

Boisrobert and T. Corneille seem to have followed the same system, and, no doubt, many others did so. But whenever these authors touch upon this point in their prefaces, they never give evidence of an intention to imitate the dramatic form which prevails in their source. On the contrary, apologies are frequent for irregularities which have been committed—irregularities which are wholly involuntary and due to the difficulty of adapting what has been taken to the more "regular" type of comedy corresponding to the French taste of the moment. Plots are simplified and remodeled, characters are modified to meet contemporary notions of *bienséance* and always with a French audience in view, never with the intention of trying to convert that audience to another type of dramatic representation.

The outstanding feature, then, of the comedies of this period consists in the ingeniously constructed plots and the no less ingeniously contrived situations. Therein it seems to follow closely the development in tragedy and tragi-comedy as exemplified by Corneille in *Rodogune* and *Héraclius*. The exposition of some of them is, in fact, as hard to follow as that of the Cornelian masterpiece of complication. The poets prided themselves upon this point. The appeal of M. de

¹ Bauzen de la Martinière, *Discours sur le style burlesque en général, et sur celui de M. Scarron en particulier, dans les "Œuvres" de Scarron*, Amsterdam, 1737. The following citation is taken from Parfaict, *op. cit.*, VI, 354.

Brosse to the reader, in the Preface to his *Innocens Coupables* of about 1645, is characteristic:

Je te prie seulement de considérer l'invention de mon sujet, la nouveauté des incidents qui l'intriguent, la ressemblance de deux filles en corsage et en habits qui ne cause pas de petites méprises, le rapport de deux jardins qui ne fait pas un équivoque désagréable, et surtout de ne point prendre les naïvetés de mon style pour des bassesses: la comique veut être sans pompe comme le sérieux sans abaissement.¹

In general, the plot material does not differ greatly from that of tragic-comedy: a prevalence of incognitos, mistaken identities, letters delivered at the wrong address, duels, abductions, recognitions, and reversals. The comic element is largely absent.

There were, without doubt, interesting divergencies, such as are found, for example, in *Le Déniaisé* of Gillet de la Tessonnerie (1647), in *Le Pédant Joué* of Cyrano de Bergerac (1654), and in *L'Amant indiscret* (1654) of Quinault. In this connection, the comedies of Scarron are especially worthy of a detailed study. While taking his material from Spanish originals in the current fashion, he is credited with having introduced a new element which is, apparently, quite justly characterized by the Parfaicts:

Avant les pièces de Scarron, on donnoit le titre de comédie à des événements presque toujours tristes. ... Nuls caractères, point de mœurs, beaucoup de reconnaissances et autant de mariages. ... Scarron ne fut pas plus régulier que ces Poètes dans la conduite de ses Poèmes Comiques et les caractères de ses personnages, mais il y semoit des plaisanteries qui décidèrent le goût du public.²

It is certain that he had considerable influence upon the writers of his time, notably upon Thomas Corneille, in pieces like the *Don Bertrand de Cigarral* and *L'Amour à la mode*, in which one has something like a forerunner of the Molièresque marquis. His favorite character, Jodellet, has, in fact, not a few of the traits of Mascarille and Sganarelle. Whether the contemporaries regarded this contribution as belonging to legitimate comedy, or whether they looked upon it as merely another manifestation of the burlesque, inseparably associated with the work of Scarron, is another question.

¹ Cited by Parfaict, *op. cit.*, VI, 321.

² *Ibid.*, Préface, pp. xii f.

During the three decades preceding the establishment of Molière in Paris, there was developed, then, a type of comedy which was distinctive of the period in which it was produced. It owed little to the Italian comedy, beside which it grew up, and still less to classic models. It did not grow out of the farce but supplanted it, at least on the stages of the Hôtel de Bourgogne and of the Théâtre du Marais. It was produced in response to a more refined public taste which no longer took delight in the crude offerings of the *farceurs*. Guillot Gorju pays a tribute to this new order of things in his *Apologie* of 1634:

La modestie est si grande à présent, et on est tellement ravi des bonnes pensées et des belles conceptions de la poésie, que chacun se tient dans sa loge comme des statues dans leur niche, et les dames sont si retenues que c'est tout ce que peut faire le Gros-Guillaume que de leur apprêter à rire.¹

A few years later Tallement des Réaux declares categorically:

Jodelet, pour un fariné naïf, est un bon acteur; il n'y a plus de farce qu'au Marais, ou il est, et c'est à cause de luy, qu'il y en a.²

If there are any traditional elements in this comedy, they are not those of the *farce* nor of the *Sottie* nor of the *Moralité*. If any ancestry must be sought, it is rather in the ancient *drame sérieux* that we should find it. It goes back to that deeply rooted instinct of the French which has always prompted them to render in dramatic form the social ideals and aspirations of the moment. This instinct, which manifested itself in the dramatizations of the Old and New Testaments, the lives of the saints and the legends of antiquity continued to function in the dramatizations of Plutarch's *Lives*, of Italian and Spanish *novelle*, the novels of a d'Urfé, of a Sorel, of a Cervantes,³ and the appropriations of plots from Spanish.

In form, French drama has always been in step with the intellectual and artistic development of the nation. The comedy preceding Molière is no exception, and it is quite misleading to insist overmuch upon the force of tradition in a *genre*, which was developed so directly under the influences engendered by the Ruelles and the *Académie naissante*. The upward of a hundred comedies produced during the period between the ancient drama and the comedy of Molière form a distinctive literary creation of no meager proportions, which de-

¹ Cited by Rigal, *A. Hardy*, p. 143, n. 4.

² *Les Historiettes*, VII (2d. ed.; Paris, 1868), 176.

³ Gillot de la Tessonnerie, *La Comédie de Francion* (1642); Guérin de Bouscal, *Don Quixote de la Manche, deux parties* (1640).

serves a more detailed and discriminating study than it has yet received.

A large proportion, at least, of these comedies scarcely correspond to the definition of the *comédie littéraire* as a type: "*dérivé de la comédie latine ... constitué par les Italiens de la Renaissance.*"¹ Surely there is need of some distinctions in the statement made by M. Lanson in regard to Molière's connection with it:

Molière a visiblement suivi deux voies: celle de la comédie littéraire, *L'Etourdi*, *le Dépit*, *Don Garcie*; celle de la Farce, *Fagoteux* et analogues, *Précieuses*, *Sganarelle*.²

For while *L'Etourdi* and *Le Dépit Amoureux* unquestionably go back to Italian models, the *Don Garcie* is entirely different; it is exactly the type of play that was being presented on the stages of the Hôtel de Bourgogne and of the Théâtre du Marais. Nor does *Sganarelle*, with the sentimental situations and effusions generated by the *portrait égaré*, belong in the same class with the farces of the *Maître Pathelin* and the *Jalousie du Barbouillé* pattern.

To be sure, the direct influence of the comedy whose development we have been sketching may have been almost nil—as M. Lanson so admirably argues. Molière was led away from it, not only by his own literary tendencies, but also by his conflict with the Hôtel de Bourgogne, which cultivated precisely this type of comedy.³ He was compelled by the logic of the situation to create something different. But, by the same token, its indirect influence became considerable. For years he had played rôles in these comedies. They represented to him the prevailing taste of the public he was bound to satisfy, if not in kind at least in equivalent. So, then, by opposition if not by direct appeal this *comédie littéraire* or *comédie intriguée et romanesque* of Corneille and his successors had its share in turning him toward the presentation of a class of characters and to the treatment of a type of moral problems not too prevalent in the Latin comedy and but roughly sketched in the Italian comedy and the farce. If it was a wind against which the poet flew, it was at least a wind which buoyed him upward in his flight from the *Fagoteux* to the *Misanthrope*. It explains in part, how the farce became great literature in his hands.

COLBERT SEARLES

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

¹ G. Lanson, "Molière et la Farce," *Revue de Paris*, CXXXII (May-June, 1911), 132.

² *Ibid.*, p. 141.

³ Cf. Ed Thierry, *Le Moliériste*, 1881-82, 3^{me} année, p. 297.

L'AFFAIRE DE LA CORRESPONDANCE GÉNÉRALE
DE J.-J. ROUSSEAU ET LA SOCIÉTÉ
J.-J. ROUSSEAU¹

En 1904 fut fondée la 'Société Jean-Jacques Rousseau.' Son but essentiel était de préparer une édition définitive des œuvres de Rousseau; surtout d'abord de la plus difficile de ces œuvres, celle qui dépend le plus de collaboration, *Les Confessions*; et comme préparation aux *Confessions* mêmes, une édition de la *Correspondance*.

Il y a donc vingt ans de cela aujourd'hui, et ces grands projets sont enfin en voie de réalisation. Déjà nous avons vu paraître les premiers volumes d'une publication monumentale de la Correspondance Générale de J.-J. Rousseau.

*Mais cette publication n'est pas faite par la Société J.-J. Rousseau.*²

Comment cela est-il arrivé? Voici la chose que nous avons à expliquer.

Rappelons d'abord que la première *Correspondance Générale* de quelque importance remonte à cent ans en arrière; c'est celle de Musset-Pathay en 1824. On peut presque dire que ce fut aussi jusqu'ici la dernière; car, on ne peut guère mentionner depuis, que les deux volumes de *Correspondance inédite* de Streckheisen-Moultou, 1861; et quant à une autre tentative de réunir l'ensemble des lettres de Rousseau depuis lors, il n'y a que celle préparée par quelque inconnu, et dans un but de vulgarisation, pour l'édition des *Œuvres* en treize volumes chez Hachette.³

Il existe du reste une quantité de collections partielles, Lettres de Rousseau à Rey (1858), à Madame Boy de la Tour (1892), à Usteri (1910), à Coindet (1922), etc. Et il y a des lettres ou groupes de lettres

¹ Présenté à la réunion de la Modern Language Association, à New York, le 30 déc., 1924.

² *Correspondance Générale de J.-J. Rousseau*, ed. Théophile Dufour. Ouvrage publié avec le concours de l'Institut de France (Fondation Debrousse et Gas). Paris: Librairie Armand Colin, 1924.

³ Aujourd'hui une édition stéréotypée, constamment reproduite, et qui, d'après Asse, remonterait jusqu'à 1865.

inédites dans cent et une revues (entre autres dans les *Annales J.-J. Rousseau*).

Le sentiment d'urgence de fondre tous ces matériaux ensemble et dans une édition possédant les garanties qu'exige la science moderne, est donc bien antérieur à la fondation de la 'Société J.-J. Rousseau,' en 1904.

Et en effet quarante ans auparavant déjà, un savant, M. Théophile Dufour, s'était fait une spécialité de recherches sur la correspondance de Rousseau. Archiviste-paléographe, M. Dufour fut pendant quinze ans Directeur des Archives et de la Bibliothèque Publique de Genève; c'est-à-dire qu'il était donc aux sources mêmes des meilleurs renseignements; et Neuchâtel, très riche aussi en manuscrits Rousseau, n'était pas loin. Il n'avait démissionné de ses fonctions que pour se donner entier à ses études personnelles; il était travailleur acharné et fort souvent en voyage pour collationner et découvrir des lettres de Rousseau; on l'appelait "M. Dufour, qui n'a jamais commis d'erreurs." Il entra dans la 'Société J.-J. Rousseau' en 1904, publia abondamment dans les *Annales*. ... En 1912 il se retira, à la veille du bi-centenaire.

Le bi-centenaire fut un triomphe pour la 'Société J.-J. Rousseau.' Sous son égide se rencontrèrent à Genève des savants venus de tous les pays du monde. Il en résulta un nouvel élan d'enthousiasme pour les études rousseauistes.

En ce qui concerne la correspondance, le travail se faisait parallèlement, et indépendamment, par M. Dufour d'une part, et par la 'Société J.-J. Rousseau' de l'autre. On s'en remettait provisoirement à la destinée pour le problème de la mise-en-œuvre commune des matériaux accumulés. ... A chaque jour suffit sa peine.

Cependant le problème se posait réellement dès que survint, le 13 novembre 1922, la mort de M. Dufour. M. Dufour n'avait pas publié, et, conscient de la crise prochaine, il avait dit ce mot: "Il est maintenant trop tard: un autre que moi publiera mon œuvre; s'il est honnête, il y mettra mon nom."

Il y eut d'abord plusieurs mois de silence embarrassé. Comment allait-on procéder?

Deux faits sont certains: (1) Les deux groupes en présence—c'est-à-dire les héritiers de M. Dufour et la 'Société J.-J. Rousseau'—sentaient qu'ils avaient besoin l'un de l'autre; la 'Société Rousseau' avait besoin des matériaux de Dufour; la famille Dufour avait besoin d'un homme du métier pour mettre en œuvre les trésors qu'elle possédait. (2) Ni l'un ni l'autre camp ne savait *jusqu'à quel point* il avait besoin de l'autre; et d'abord ni la 'Société Rousseau' ne savait exactement ce qu'il y avait chez Dufour—peut-être les richesses n'étaient-elles pas tout ce qu'on pensait; ni la famille Dufour ne savait exactement ce qu'il pouvait y avoir à la 'Société Rousseau'—peut-être y avait-il plus qu'on ne pensait; et ensuite la 'Société J.-J. Rousseau' ne savait jusqu'à quel point son aide était indispensable, et si les "papiers Dufour" n'étaient pas presque prêts pour l'impression.

En somme, cependant, tout le monde désirait une entente; tout le monde était très certain que la solution de deux Correspondances Générales publiées concurremment, serait déplorable.

Il y eut deux protagonistes, une fois que les pourparlers s'engagèrent:

M. Alexis François, Secrétaire de la 'Société J.-J. Rousseau'—ardent, enthousiaste, vainqueur; soutenu, semble-t-il, par M. Lanson et par M. D. Mornet (celui-ci venait de reprendre la direction de la *Revue d'Histoire littéraire*); et Madame Hélène Pittard-Dufour (en littérature Noëlle Roger), fille de M. Dufour.

M. François obtint de publier la Correspondance Générale de Rousseau dans la 'Collection des Grands Ecrivains de la France,' chez Hachette. Un contrat était signé le 6 mars 1923. Outre la *Correspondance* on prévoyait une Edition critique des *Confessions* en cinq volumes.¹ Tout allait fort bien; et de fait, les héritiers Dufour se montraient disposés à remettre à la 'Société J.-J. Rousseau' les "papiers Dufour," réclamant cependant en cas de publication en commun, que le nom de Dufour parût à la place d'honneur, c'est-à-dire sur la page du titre.

Là était la difficulté. M. François refusa—en tout cas accorda trop peu. Mme Pittard ne céda pas. L'attente se prolongeait. Suivit une ère de pourparlers, de conseils de famille, d'interventions d'agents

¹ Cf. *Annales J.-J. R.*, XV, 381, 382; aussi *Le Temps*, 3 juillet, 1923.

intermédiaires. ... M. François allait capituler, peut-être même avait-il capitulé, quand un coup de théâtre se produisit. Par une note du *Journal des Débats*, du 3 août 1923, on comprit, et par un article de la *Revue de Paris*, du 15 septembre 1923, (ce dernier du à la plume de Mme Pittard) on apprit que la famille Dufour avait trouvé un éditeur qui n'était pas M. François, et une maison d'édition qui n'était pas celle de Hachette.

L'éditeur était M. Pierre-Paul Plan, d'une vieille famille genevoise, versé dans l'art de la bibliographie (couronné par l'Académie pour un travail bibliographique sur Rabelais), rousseauiste même à ses heures. La maison d'édition était celle d'Armand Colin, émule de la Maison Hachette, mais qui n'avait pas jusque là spécialisé dans la publication de livres par et sur Rousseau. Ajoutons encore que l'entreprise reçut bientôt la promesse d'une subvention de l'Institut de France; le revenu de la Fondation Debrousse et Gas.

La Société J.-J. Rousseau se retira de la lice.

Ce qui avait en partie justifié la 'Société Rousseau' dans ses hésitations, c'est que—comme nous l'avons déjà donné à entendre—elle ne savait pas *au juste* le contenu des papiers Dufour; ceux-ci ne lui furent jamais communiqués. Mais on comprend aussi d'autre part que, à supposer que les transactions n'aboutissent pas (comme de fait elles n'aboutirent pas), la famille Dufour n'ait pas tenu à révéler ses richesses à ceux qui pouvaient devenir des rivaux. Il y avait eu, du reste, après la mort de M. Dufour une série d'escarmouches à coup d'inédits—chacun voulant montrer qu'il avait des trésors dont l'autre ne pouvait guère se passer s'il prétendait faire une publication qui put réellement mériter le nom de *Correspondance Générale*. (Voir pour le côté Alexis François, qui ouvrit les feux, divers numéros du *Journal de Genève*, de la *Semaine Littéraire*, de la *Revue de Genève*, de la *Bibliothèque Universelle*—tout cela recueilli dans une petite publication *Matériaux pour la Correspondance J.-J. R.*, Paris, 1923; et pour le côté Dufour, *Journal des Débats*, 21 juin, 1923, 3 août, 1923; *Revue de Paris*, 15 septembre, 1923.)

Cet épisode des inédits fut une des voies par lesquelles le public eut vent de ces discordes. Il y en eut une autre. Les presses, genevoise et parisienne, avaient été d'une discrétion remarquable. Mais tout de

même les deux camps tenaient à justifier leur attitude; et deux brochures furent imprimées mais non mises dans le commerce.

Les voici:

1. *L'affaire des papiers Dufour et la correspondance de J.-J. Rousseau, Lettre à M. Bernard Bouvier, Président de la Société J.-J. Rousseau*, par Alexis François, Professeur à l'Université de Genève, Secrétaire de la Soc. J.-J. Rousseau. Genève, Octobre, 1923. 22 pages.

2. *L'affaire des papiers de Théophile Dufour, et la Correspondance de J.-J. Rousseau*. Lettre ouverte à M. Alexis François, Genève, fin 1923.

L'épigraphe de cette dernière brochure trahit le ton de la polémique:

Quos vult Jupiter perdere, dementat prius.

On trouvera aussi quelques échos des débats dans le Volume XV (pour 1922), des *Annales J.-J. Rousseau*, pages 379-85. Là, le moment exact de la rupture est fixé au 10 octobre, 1923—à la suite d'une lettre de Mme Pittard du 22 septembre. On y cite ce mot d'une lettre de M. Lanson à M. Bouvier: "J'ai été suffisamment instruit des négociations pour juger que ni la 'Société J.-J. Rousseau,' ni M. François ne sont responsables de leur rupture" (p. 385).

Aboutissement.—Nous allons avoir le *Correspondance Générale*—mieux ou moins bien que si elle avait été éditée par M. François, nous ne savons pas, mais—fort bien faite, en une vingtaine de volumes élégants. Nous aurons également une édition des *Confessions*, en conséquence; nous aurons enfin une *Bibliographie critique des Œuvres de Rousseau* publiée avec les papiers Dufour, par M. Pierre-Paul Plan.

De la *Correspondance Générale*, deux¹ volumes sont sortis de presse; on en prévoit trois ou quatre par an. Sans insister sur l'utilité de cette publication—si évidente—pour les savants, elle en aura un autre pour le grand public et qu'il vaut la peine de souligner même en Amérique. On nous permettra de reproduire quelques mots de notre article dans le *New York Times Book Review*, du Dimanche 11 janvier 1925, au sujet de l'apparition du Volume I de la *Correspondance Générale*:

There is one point which needs to be emphasized, namely, the far-reaching result those twenty stout volumes are going to have in bringing to a close the

¹ Trois depuis que ces pages sont écrites.

days of the Rousseau muckrakers. Whoever is familiar with Rousseau literature knows well how many were those who, for various reasons—simply out of dislike for Rousseau's ideas, or because they liked someone in the eighteenth century who had quarreled with Rousseau (e.g., Perey and Maugras, "the friends" of Madame d'Epinay, Scherer, "a friend" of Grimm, etc.)—indulged freely and constantly in vicious insinuations against the citizen of Geneva. They will be able to do this to a considerable less degree now, for they will not dare to face the easy refutation coming from the *Correspondance*. Rousseau can stand on his own merit—and most muckrakers know as well as we do that his reputation will not suffer by it.

Et la 'Société Jean-Jacques Rousseau' ?—Elle sent que son prestige a souffert, qu'une de ses raisons d'être a disparu. Cependant il y d'autres raisons d'être pour elle; et elle a résolu de ne pas mourir. M. François, il est vrai, s'est retiré sous sa tente; jusqu'à la publication du Volume XV des *Annales*, il avait résisté aux sollicitations de rester à son poste de Secrétaire de la 'Société J.-J. Rousseau'; nous savons aujourd'hui qu'un autre va prendre sa place, à savoir, le Dr Louis J. Courtois.

Il faut ici rendre hommage aux efforts généreux de M. Bernard Bouvier, tout au cours de 'l'affaire,' pour arriver à la solution équitable; de plus, rendre aujourd'hui hommage à son courage en décidant de marcher de l'avant. Tout étudiant de Rousseau, et tout ami des lettres lui doit, et lui apportera, un cordial appui. Nous saluons aussi le nouveau secrétaire, travailleur modeste et probe, qui a fait ses preuves. Le Volume XV des *Annales* est un témoignage magnifique à la vitalité de la Société; et justement le travail d'érudition immense, minutieuse, et grandement utile qui le remplit presque tout entier, "Chronologie critique de la vie et des œuvres de J.-J. Rousseau," est sorti de la plume du nouveau secrétaire.

Il n'y a pas, et il ne peut y avoir aucune incompatibilité entre les efforts de l'éditeur de la *Correspondance Générale*, et ceux des éditeurs des *Annales*. Aussi nous nous permettons, nous qui avons été loin du fracas des batailles, de terminer par un vœu, et de le faire au nom de tous les étudiants de Rousseau qui se trouvent dans la même position que nous: c'est celui de la reprise immédiate du travail en commun.

Nous venons de relire, au Tome II de la *Correspondance Générale*, (qui sort de presse) ce qui se rapporte à la noble conduite de Rousseau

envers Palissot, l'auteur de la comédie des Philosophes, jouée devant la cour du roi Stanislas à Nancy. Cette comédie, on s'en souvient, rendait ridicule Rousseau, et Palissot fut menacé d'expulsion de l'Académie de Nancy. Rousseau n'avait pas eu de repos, lorsqu'il avait entendu parler de l'incident, qu'il n'eût fait absoudre et entièrement réhabiliter Palissot. Il écrit en termes fort beaux combien il lui avait été pénible d'avoir, même innocemment, été l'occasion de sentiments de discorde. Rousseau aurait, à n'en pas douter, les mêmes sentiments aujourd'hui: Ne serait-il pas à propos de s'en souvenir? Or, l'une des parties qui se sont trouvées en présence est aujourd'hui en situation de donner comme Rousseau, et au nom de Rousseau, un bel exemple de magnanimité—tout en servant la science. Nous savons que la 'Société J.-J. Rousseau' a entre les mains quelques documents de valeur pour la *Correspondance*, et qui lui ont été envoyés par un Rousseauiste d'Amérique; ses représentants ont, de plus, donné clairement à entendre, au cours des débats, qu'ils possédaient de vrais trésors;— et chacun l'aurait deviné si même cela n'eût pas été dit. N'oserions-nous pas, comme membre de la Société Rousseau, proposer tout simplement à notre Comité exécutif, d'offrir à M. Pierre-Paul Plan tout ce qui dans les archives de la Société concerne la correspondance? Il n'est pas d'honnête homme qui résiste à ce geste, et qui ne désire, en retour, faire davantage que ce qu'on aura fait pour lui. Plus que personne, M. Plan, qui, au cours de toute l'affaire joua un rôle si discret, mérite qu'on lui fasse confiance. Personne ne perdrait à cet arrangement, tout le monde au contraire y gagnerait. Hâtons donc l'heure de la féconde paix.

ALBERT SCHINZ

SMITH COLLEGE

BLAKE ET LES CELTOMANES

Adam was a Druid, and Noah also.—BLAKE, *Descriptive Catalogue*.

Il n'est peut-être pas dans tout Blake de phrase qui ait fait plus de tort à sa réputation, et qui ait plus contribué à le faire passer pour fou. Si l'on peut donner à cette affirmation un sens rationnel, on aura donc rendu service à la gloire du poète, et, ce qui est plus important, on aura élucidé l'une des énigmes qui tiennent le plus de place dans son œuvre. En même temps on se sera rendu compte, sur un point précis, de la façon dont son esprit travaillait, et de la relation entre ses idées et celles de son époque.

Les textes de Blake sont si embrouillés qu'il me paraît préférable de procéder à l'inverse de la méthode ordinaire et de résumer ses idées générales sur ce sujet avant d'examiner les passages où il les exprime. D'ailleurs, cette façon de procéder est, en fin de compte, la plus logique: ces idées n'appartiennent pas à Blake, mais à son époque; elles ont été exprimées avant lui, et clairement; c'est sans doute ce fait qui lui a permis de les développer de si obscure façon.

M. Camille Jullian nous donne une liste des textes qui témoignent de l'idéalisation des Druides dès l'antiquité.¹ Une suite ininterrompue d'auteurs, depuis les Alexandrins, ont essayé de persuader au monde que la source de toute sagesse et de toute vertu était dans le druidisme. La Renaissance n'a pas manqué de donner une nouvelle force à ces théories attrayantes pour l'orgueil de l'Occident. Milton les a exprimées:

Writers of good antiquity and able judgment have been persuaded that even the school of Pythagoras and the Persian wisdom took beginning from the old philosophy of this island.²

Le XVIII^e siècle, avec ses théories sur les Atlantes d'une part, et les premiers essais d'études celtiques de l'autre, a assisté à l'éclosion d'une riche littérature sur ce sujet des Druides. Et il est facile de se

¹ *Histoire de la Gaule*, II, 67.

² *Arcopagitica* (Bohn ed.) II, 90.

convaincre, en en parcourant une partie, que les idées de Blake n'ont à son époque rien de bien extraordinaire.

Le Français Pezron donne la note au début du siècle, en publiant en 1703 son livre sur *l'Antiquité de la Nation et de la Langue des Celts*, traduit en anglais en 1706 par un Mr. Jones.

We find, and that, upon the authority of Aristotle and Sotion, that the very rudiments of philosophy came from the Barbarians amongst whom the Celtae, or Gauls, were reckoned. And tho' Diogenes Laertius be of a contrary opinion, it is no hard matter to overthrow all his arguments, and this author makes himself ridiculous to a great degree in pretending that philosophy had its origin from the Grecians.¹

La théorie proposée est celle-ci: Gomer, le fils aîné de Japhet, a donné naissance aux Titans, qui furent les ancêtres des Gaulois. Leurs rois, Saturne, Jupiter, etc., devinrent ensuite les dieux des Grecs, et ce sont ces Titans-Gaulois qui civilisèrent la Grèce.

Stukeley, qui fut célèbre vers le milieu du siècle par ses études sur Stonehenge et Abury, identifia le Druidisme avec la religion des patriarches. D'après lui, lorsqu' Abraham vint en Egypte il y rencontra Hercule, qui était le dernier des rois pasteurs, ou Hyksos, et Hercule devint son disciple. Puis Hercule vint en Occident, et colonisa la Grande-Bretagne, où il installa un grand nombre des siens, qui furent les Druides.²

Un peu plus tard, Bailly émit ses célèbres théories sur l'Atlantide. Avec une science remarquable il dépouilla les tables astronomiques des Indiens rapportées par les missionnaires, et arriva à cette conclusion rendue célèbre plus tard par sa controverse avec Voltaire et ses *Lettres sur l'Atlantide* (1777) et *Lettres sur l'Origine des Sciences* (1777): les calculs des Indiens comportent certaines erreurs qui démontrent que leurs observations astronomiques ont été faites non pas sous les latitudes de l'Inde, mais environ à la hauteur du 49e degré de latitude nord. Bailly en conclut que les Indiens n'avaient pas fait ces calculs eux-mêmes, mais les avaient reçus par tradition d'un peuple plus avancé qu'eux en civilisation, et habitant le sud de la Sibérie. L'étude des textes anciens à la lumière de cette théorie conduisit Bailly à construire toute une histoire de l'antiquité préclassique.

¹ *The Antiquities of Nations* (London, 1706), Preface, p. xii.

² Stukeley, *Abury* (1743), pp. 72-74.

L'Atlantide avait été près du pôle Nord: le Groenland, l'Islande, le Spitzberg, La Nouvelle Zemble, en sont des restes. Le refroidissement de la terre et diverses catastrophes cosmiques en chassèrent les Hyperboréens, peuple qui, descendu vers le 49e degré de latitude, fonda en Sibérie une civilisation mère de toutes les autres. Mais de cette même Atlantide septentrionale sortit un second essaim d'émigrants, les Atlantes, qui envahirent le pays des Hyperboréens. Ceux-ci en se dispersant devant cette invasion, allèrent civiliser l'Inde, la Chine, etc.

Mais cette histoire ne faisait pas du tout l'affaire des Celtomanes, puisqu'elle expliquait tout sans faire intervenir les Celtes ou les Druides. Aussi Bailly fut-il violemment attaqué, en 1777, par l'Abbé Baudeau, qui publia son *Mémoire à consulter pour les anciens Druides gaulois contre M. Bailly, de l'Académie des Sciences*. Baudeau explique que les véritables Atlantes furent les Gaulois, et essaie de tirer parti à son profit des ingénieux travaux de l'astronome. Nous retrouvons dans l'ouvrage de Baudeau Pythagore, élève des Druides, l'invention du feu dans les Pyrénées (démontrée par la racine Pyr), la source des sciences et des arts dans les Iles britanniques.

Les ouvrages de Bailly eurent un grand succès en Angleterre et toute la controverse fut évidemment suivie avec beaucoup d'intérêt par l'Europe entière, puisque Voltaire y prit part.

Un pas de plus fut fait par les Celtomanes lorsque le barde gallois Edward Williams publia ses *Poèmes* en 1794. Il y inclut les fameuses *Triades*, connues depuis 1601 (d'après Davies, *Celtic Researches*, p. 153) et une véritable profession de foi:

The Patriarchal Religion of Ancient Britain, called Druidism, . . . is no more inimical to Christianity than the religion of Noah, Job, or Abraham; it has never, as some imagine, been quite extinct in Britain; the Welsh Bards have through all ages, *down to the present*, kept it alive. . . .

Ancient British Christianity was strongly tinged with Druidism. The old Welsh Bards kept up a perpetual war with the Church of Rome. . . . Narrow understandings may conceive that they were . . . less Christian for having been Druids. The doctrine of metempsychosis is that which of all others most clearly vindicates the ways of God to Man.¹

Williams construisit sur ces données tout un système de métaphysique religieuse, en 29 articles, dans lesquels il décrit une pro-

¹ *Poems*, II (1794), 194.

gression de l'âme de réincarnation en réincarnation, système qui n'a d'ailleurs rien d'original.

Edward Davies, par ses *Celtic Researches*, publiées en 1804, nous est un témoin précieux des idées agitées par les contemporains de Blake. Pour lui aussi, les Celtes sont les descendants de Noé, de Gomer, des Titans, et des Géants. Les Druides ont préservé dans toute sa pureté la tradition primitive qui émane de Noé, d'Adam, et de Dieu.¹

La philosophie de la Grèce est sortie des Celtes, et Pythagore était l'élève des Druides qui lui ont enseigné la métempsychose; Atlas était aussi un fils de Japhet. Hercule, par contre, est rejeté: ce n'était qu'un barbare qui n'a fait que des raids en Occident.²

Mais Davies va plus loin. Il présume que les Druides, après avoir dûment instruit Pythagore, l'ont envoyé dans l'Inde. Et il cite Wilford, qui en 1791, dans un périodique,³ avait affirmé que "*the Indous know of Britain by name (Bretashtan) as the abode of the Pitris who were the fathers of the human race.*" Ces Pitris existaient encore en Grande-Bretagne, et des Hindous venaient encore les y voir. En 1791, un Hindou, en train d'accomplir ce pèlerinage, était arrivé jusqu'à Moscou.⁴

Et Davies conclut triomphalement que la sagesse était venue à l'Inde et à la Grèce des Iles Britanniques.

Mais Davies, si précieux qu'il soit en lui-même, est encore plus précieux comme témoin. Il va déjà bien loin, mais il ne va pas si loin que d'autres dont il nous parle. Il commente les ballades galloises et nous dit:

Patriarchs are made almost exclusively the fathers of the Cymry, and the general events of early ages are consigned particularly to the Island of Britain.

Ainsi, au déluge:

All mankind were drowned, except only two persons who escaped in a boat; of them was re-peopled the Island of Britain.⁵

La conscience chrétienne de Davies est choquée de ces extravagances, et il dit que tout cela "*illustrates the nostra-tism of all national traditions.*"

¹ Pp. 124, 133, 150.

² Pp. 184-93.

³ *Asiat. Rec.*, V, 3.

⁴ Pp. 193-99.

⁵ Pp. 153, 157, 163.

Mais nous avons rassemblé ici toutes les idées sur les Druides que nous retrouverons dans Blake; et s'il était fou, du moins l'était-il en compagnie. Noé était bien un Druide, au grand scandale de Davies, puisque c'est en Grande-Bretagne et non sur le mont Ararat qu'il avait établi sa famille au sortir de l'arche. Quant à Adam, il était évidemment l'un de ces "*Pitris who were the fathers of the human race*" et qui habitaient également la Grande-Bretagne. Adam était donc aussi un Druide, et l'Indou venu jusqu'à Moscou était là pour en témoigner. Ce n'était pas Blake qui avait inventé tout cela, pas plus que la survivance au milieu des montagnes galloises des sages primitifs, qu'Edward Williams connaissait (il en était probablement un lui-même) et que les Indous venaient voir, en 1791 et en 1794, bien avant que Blake n'écrivit son *Descriptive Catalogue*.

Comment Blake avait su tout cela? Plus nous étudierons Blake, et plus il faudra nous persuader qu'il n'existait pas une absurdité dans l'Europe de la fin du XVIII^e siècle que Blake ne connût. Il est infiniment probable qu'il fréquentait quelque milieu swedenborgien et occultiste où l'on se communiquait avec commentaires et développements appropriés tout ce qui se passait dans l'Europe intellectuelle de ce temps. Les affirmations de Blake ont rarement le caractère de reproduction de documents livresques: elles font partie d'un fonds de communications orales, de traditions racontées, de conversations où la fantaisie individuelle enrichit les divagations collectives.

Voyons maintenant ce que Blake a fait de ces éléments si riches en possibilités.

Naturellement, Blake adopte la forme extrême de la théorie. L'humanité est née en Occident. Adam était Druide. Blake l'appelle par conséquent Albion. Les Druides furent donc les premiers hommes, les premiers civilisés, les fondateurs de la première religion. Les Druides sont donc à l'origine de toutes les civilisations, et en particulier à la source de la plus importante de toutes: la civilisation juive. Les patriarches étaient des Druides. On trouve ici en formation la légende occultiste qui, avec Fabre d'Olivet, un peu plus tard, deviendra célèbre sous le nom de "cycle de Ram": l'épopée d'une grande migration celte partie de l'Atlantique et allant jusqu'au Pacifique, à travers tout le continent, et colonisant et civilisant au passage la Grèce, la Palestine, la Babylone, la Perse, l'Inde, et la Chine. Plus

tard encore on découvrira la raison de cette migration dans l'engloutissement de l'Atlantide, catastrophe prévue par les sages, qui pour l'éviter emmenèrent une partie de leur peuple vers l'Orient. Ces idées fermentaient déjà autour de Blake.

Ainsi Jérusalem est une émanation d'Albion. *Jerusalem the emanation of the giant Albion*. Non seulement en un sens métaphysique ou mythique, en tant que partie féminine de l'âme d'Albion, mais au sens historique, en tant que race sortie de Grande-Bretagne. Rappelons-nous que c'est vers 1790 que Richard Brothers eut ses révélations, et apprit aux Anglais qu'ils étaient les dix tribus perdues d'Israel: toute une littérature se développa pour démontrer l'identité de la race juive et de la race anglaise. Blake change à peine cette idée de direction en suivant les Celtomanes et en faisant sortir les Juifs d'Angleterre.

Ici intervient l'influence d'un mythe connexe, que nous étudierons ailleurs,¹ le mythe de la division, puis de la reconstitution de l'hermaphrodite divin, sous-produit de la grande tradition qui a donné la dégradation puis la Reconstitution de l'Un chez Plotin.

A la chute Jérusalem s'est séparée d'Albion. A la consommation des temps, Jérusalem doit se réunir à Albion. Métaphysiquement, mais aussi historiquement: les Juifs doivent rentrer en Angleterre, et Blake, avec tout le soin méticuleux d'un maréchal des logis casant une compagnie, a distribué les comtés de Grande-Bretagne entre les tribus d'Israel.

A la lumière de la théorie, nous pouvons maintenant examiner les textes.

Descriptive Catalogue: The Ancient Britons: The Britons (say historians) were naked civilised men, learned, studious, abstruse in thought and contemplation, naked, simple, plain in their acts and manners, wiser than after ages. . . .

. . . . The British antiquities are now in the artists' hands. . . .

. . . . Mr. B. has on his hand poems of the highest antiquity. . . .

. . . . Adam was a Druid, and Noah also; Abraham was called to succeed the Druidical age. . . .

. . . . In the meantime (Mr. B.) has painted this picture, which supposes that . . . in the fifth century there were remains of those naked heroes in the Welsh mountains; they are there now; Gray saw them in the person of his bard on Snowden; there they dwell in naked simplicity. . . .

¹ J'ai donné des indications à ce sujet déjà dans la *Revue de litt. comparée*, III (1923), 344 ff.

. . . . The giant Albion was Patriarch of the Atlantic; he is the Atlas of the Greeks, one of those the Greeks call Titans. . . .

Vision of the Last Judgment: "He is Albion, our Ancestor, patriarch of the Atlantic Continent, whose history preceded that of the Hebrews."

C'est donc bien de l'Atlantis engloutie que parle Blake: *the Atlantic Continent*; son histoire a précédé celle des Hébreux; Adam, le premier homme de l'histoire hébraïque, était un Druide venu d'Atlantis. La science du temps, avec Bailly, cherchait l'origine des civilisations et des races hors de la Bible, alors que cinquante ou cent ans auparavant, Pezron ou Stukeley cherchaient à faire dériver les Celtes de Gomer ou d'Abraham.

Noé était aussi un druide: dans les Triades galloises qui scandalisaient Davies, c'est en Grande-Bretagne qu'il survit. Et ce n'est pas au déluge biblique qu'il survit par conséquent, mais à l'engloutissement de l'Atlantide, car la Grande-Bretagne est un fragment du continent fabuleux. La légende est en pleine formation à la fin du XVIIIe siècle—si l'on s'en fie aux textes; oralement, il est probable qu'elle est formée depuis longtemps parmi les initiés, occultistes ou Celtomanes. Ce ne sont probablement que des allusions et des fragments que nous trouvons dans Blake, parce que des allusions suffisaient pour ceux à qui il destinait son enseignement. Le but de Blake n'est pas de nous instruire d'une tradition, mais, parlant à ceux qui la connaissent, d'y ajouter ses révélations individuelles. D'où son manque de clarté pour les non-initiés. A un Swedenborgien, à un occultiste des cercles que fréquentait Blake, ses allusions eussent été claires. Mais la tradition occultiste; en général non fixée par des textes, varie avec une rapidité plus grande peut-être que celle de toute autre tradition. Par conséquent nous ne pouvons guère qu'essayer de deviner ce que cette catégorie d'esprits pouvaient penser à la fin du XVIIIe siècle, en nous aidant de textes insuffisants. Et c'est pourtant là, me semble-t-il, que git l'explication véritable de Blake.

Autre trait: les héros habitent encore les montagnes galloises. Williams avait dit "*down to the present*" en 1794; Blake dit "*they are there now*." Rien de ce passage clair de Blake ne lui appartient donc en propre.

Il n'est guère utile de relever les allusions aux Druides qu'on trouve dans toute l'œuvre de Blake; elles ne nous apprennent rien de plus. Seul le grand poème de *Jerusalem* est à examiner à la lumière de ces idées, car le sujet de *Jerusalem* est précisément celui-là: comment Jérusalem est sortie d'Albion, de Grande-Bretagne, et comment elle s'y réintègrera.

Y a-t-il dans *Jerusalem* des allusions à la catastrophe de l'Atlantide? Peut-être, et peut-être non. Du point de vue des textes, la légende n'est qu'en formation. Mais c'est bien une catastrophe qui annihile la Grande-Bretagne et qui disperse les prêtres, les faisant se réfugier jusqu'en Palestine et en Egypte. Ce sont les fragments du récit classique que nous retrouvons au début de *Jerusalem*:

In all the dark Atlantic vale down from the hills of Surrey
A black water accumulates. . . .
Albion's mountains run with blood, the cries of war and tumult
Resound into the unbounded night. . . .
Jerusalem is scatter'd abroad like a cloud of smoke. . . .
Moab and Ammon and Amalek and Canaan and Egypt and Aram
Receive her little ones for sacrifices and the delights of cruelty.¹

Blake ajoute simplement à la donnée traditionnelle sa condamnation de la religion formelle, qu'il identifie ici à celle de l'Ancien Testament: car il considère parfois le Jehovah de la Bible comme son ennemi particulier. La description à la fin du poème, d'Albion pendant sa période d'abaissement, fait aussi penser à l'Atlantide engloutie:

Albion cold lays on his Rock; storms and snows beat round him
Howling winds cover him: roaring seas dash furious against him;
In the deep darkness broad lightnings, long thunders roll.
The weeds of Death inwrap his hands and feet, blown incessant
And wash'd incessant by the forever restless sea-waves, foaming abroad
Upon the white rock. . . .
And the body of Albion was closed apart from all Nations.²

C'est bien une catastrophe maritime que décrit Blake, et les associations entre Albion dormant sur le roc des Ages et Atlantis engloutie sont inévitables, quel que soit dans Blake le degré d'évolution de la légende: c'est la même légende qui évolue.

And the voices of Bath and Canterbury and York and Edinburgh, cry
Over the Plow of Nations in the strong hand of Albion, thundering along

¹*Jerusalem*, pp. 4, 5.

²*Ibid.*, p. 94.

Among the Fires of the Druid and the deep black rethundering Waters
Of the Atlantic which poured in impetuous loud, loud, louder and louder,
And the great voice of the Atlantic howled over the Druid Altars.¹

Voilà donc la catastrophe, et voici une allusion à ce qui l'avait précédée:

Therefore remove from Albion these terrible Surfaces
And let wild seas and rocks close up Jerusalem away from
The Atlantic Mountains where giants dwelt in Intellect,
Now given to stony Druids. . . .²

Il faut d'ailleurs marquer que pour Blake, non seulement Noé fut un Druide, mais qu'il fut le dernier des vrais Druides: ceux qui après la catastrophe, restèrent en Occident, devinrent les représentants d'une religion cruelle et dégénérée: "stony Druids" comme il les appelle un peu partout. C'est cette décadence, nous l'avons vu, qui rendit nécessaire la venue d'Abraham:

Abraham was called to succeed the Druidical age, which began to turn allegorical and mental signification into corporal command, whereby human sacrifice would have depopulated the earth.³

Il nous faut admettre que quelques-uns d'entre ces druides n'avaient pas dégénéré, puisqu'on les trouvait encore, *naked heroes*, du temps de Blake. Il faut admettre également qu'il est assez indifférent à Blake de se contredire.

Mais qu'il les loue ou qu'il les condamne, c'est d'Angleterre que sont partis les Druides pour civiliser l'univers.

And London walked in every Nation, mutual in Love and harmony—
Albion cover'd the whole Earth, England encompassed the nations.⁴

Et Blake déclare aux déistes: "Your Greek philosophy . . . is a remnant of Druidism."⁵

Cette idée générale bien établie, passons à l'application particulière aux Juifs. Blake s'adresse à eux en prose, entre le chapitre i et le chapitre ii de *Jerusalem*, et leur dit:

Jerusalem the Emanation of the Giant Albion! Can it be? Is it a Truth
that the Learned⁶ have explored? Was Britain the Primitive Seat of the

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 57.

⁴ *Jerusalem*, p. 24.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 49-50.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 52.

³ *Descriptive Catalogue*.

⁶ *The learned*, ce sont les divers auteurs que nous avons cités, et dont il a tiré tout ce qui suit. Abraham, les autels de pierre, les pierres "druidiques" et les chênes sont fréquemment associés dans toute cette littérature.

Patriarchal Religion? If it is true, my title-page is also True, that Jerusalem was & is the Emanation of the Giant Albion. It is True, and cannot be controverted. Ye are united, O ye Inhabitants of Earth, in One Religion: The Religion of Jesus: the most Ancient, the Eternal & the Everlasting Gospel. The Wicked will turn it to Wickedness, the Righteous to Righteousness. Amen! Huzza! Selah!

Your Ancestors derived their origin from Abraham, Heber, Shem, and Noah, who were Druids: as the Druid Temples (which are the Patriarchal Pillars & Oak Groves) over the whole Earth witness to this day.

You have a tradition, that Man anciently contain'd in his mighty limbs all things in Heaven & Earth: this you received from the Druids.

But now the Starry Heavens are fled from the mighty limbs of Albion.

Albion was the Parent of the Druids: & in his Chaotic State of Sleep Satan & Adam & the whole World was Created by the Elohim.

Il continue en vers, plus enthousiastes encore, moins compréhensibles il est vrai, mais dont l'idée générale est bien la même:

The fields from Islington to Marybone,
To Primrose Hill and Saint John's Wood,
Were builded over with pillars of gold
And there Jerusalem's pillars stood.

The Jew's-harp-house & the Green Man,
The Ponds where Boys to bathe delight,
The fields of Cows by William's farm,
Shine in Jerusalem's pleasant sight.

She walks upon our meadows green:
The Lamb of God walks by her side:
And every English Child is seen,
Children of Jesus and his Bride.

Et il termine en prose par une claire allusion aux doctrines de l'Adam-Kadmon de la Cabale, à la division du Géant primitif dont tous les êtres ont été tirés par le sacrifice. Suivant la tradition chrétienne, inaugurée par Pic de la Mirandole, il cherche, d'ailleurs, à se servir de la Cabale pour opérer la conversion des Juifs.

If Humility is Christianity, you, O Jews, are the true Christians; if your tradition that Man contained in his Limbs all Animals is True and they were separated from him by cruel sacrifices; and when compulsory cruel Sacrifices had brought Humanity into a Feminine Tabernacle, in the loins of Abraham and David, the Lamb of God, the Saviour became apparent on Earth as the Prophets had foretold! The Return of Israel is a Return to Mental Sacrifice & War. Take up the Cross, O Israel, & follow Jesus.

Les Juifs sont donc sortis d'Angleterre: Blake est très documenté sur cet Exode. Ils se sont enfuis lors du conflit entre Luvah et Urizen, c'est à dire lors de la chute:

. . . . When they fled out at Jerusalem's Gates,
Away from the conflict of Luvah & Urizen, fixing the Gates
In the Twelve Counties of Wales & thence Gates looking every way,
To the four Points, conduct to England & Scotland & Ireland,
And thence to all the Kingdom & Nations & Families of the Earth.

Et Blake nous donne les lieux d'origine, ou les lieux de passage (ce n'est pas très clair) des tribus:

The Gate of Reuben in Carmarthenshire: the Gate of Simeon in
Cardiganshire: & the Gate of Levi in Montgomeryshire:
The Gate of Judah, Merionethshire: the Gate of Dan, Flintshire:
The Gate of Naphtali, Radnorshire: the Gate of Gad, Pembrokeshire:
The Gate of Asher, Carnarvonshire: the Gate of Issachar, Brecknockshire:
The Gate of Zebulun, in Anglesea & Sodor, so is Wales divided,
The Gate of Joseph, Denbighshire: the Gate of Benjamin, Glamorganshire:
For the protection of the Twelve Emanations of Albion's Sons.
And the Forty Counties of England are thus divided in the Gates:
Of Reuben, Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex: Simeon, Lincoln, York, Lancashire:
Levi, Middlesex, Kent, Surrey: Judah, Somerset, Gloucester, Wiltshire.
Dan, Cornwall, Devon, Dorset.

Et Blake continue le catalogue jusqu'au bout des tribus et des comtés.

Cependant certains des fils de Jérusalem sont restés en Grande-Bretagne, et même en Irlande:

Because Twelve Sons of Jerusalem fled successive thro' the Gates,
But the Four Sons of Jerusalem who fled not but remain'd
Are Rintrah & Palamabron & Theotormon & Bromion,
The Four that remain with Los to guard the Western Wall:
And these Four remain to guard the Four Walls of Jerusalem,
Whose foundations remain in the Thirty-two Counties of Ireland,
And in Twelve Counties of Wales, & in the Forty Counties
Of England, & in the Thirty-six Counties of Scotland.
And the names of the Thirty-two Counties of Ireland are these:
Under Judah & Issachar & Zebulum are Lowth, Longford,
Eastmeath, Westmeath, Dublin, Kildare, King's County,
Queen's County, Wicklow, Catherloh, Wexford, Kilkenny:
And those under Reuben & Simeon & Levi are these.¹

Et Blake recommence un catalogue semblable au premier. Puis il élargit son champ de vision, et nous explique que non seulement les

¹ Jerusalem, p. 72.

Juifs, mais toutes les nations sont issues d'Angleterre, et qu'elles doivent y revenir:

All these Center in London & in Golgonooza, from whence
They are Created continually, East & West & North & South:
And from them are Created all the Nations of the Earth,
Europe & Asia & Africa & America, in fury Fourfold!

And Thirty-two the Nations, to dwell in Jerusalem's Gates.
O Come ye Nations, Come ye People, Come up to Jerusalem.
Return, Jerusalem, & dwell together as of old: Return,
Return: O Albion, let Jerusalem overspread all Nations,
As in the times of old; O Albion awake! Reuben wanders,
The Nations wait for Jerusalem, they look up for the Bride.

France, Spain, Italy, Germany, Poland, Russia, Sweden, Turkey,
Arabia, Palestine, Persia, Hindostan, China, Tartary, Siberia.

Voici les lamentations de Jérusalem au bord de l'Euphrate. C'est
l'Angleterre qu'elle regrette:

How distant far from Albion! his hills & his valleys no more
Receive the feet of Jerusalem: they have cast me quite away:
And Albion is himself shrunk to a narrow rock in the middle of the sea!
The plains of Sussex & Surrey, their hills of flocks & herds,
No more seek to Jerusalem nor to the sound of my Holy-ones.
The Fifty-two Counties of England are harden'd against me
As if I was not their Mother, they despise me & cast me out.
London cover'd the whole Earth, England encompass'd the Nations,
And all the Nations of the Earth were seen in the Cities of Albion.

Albion gave me to the whole Earth to walk up & down; to pour
Joy upon every mountain, to teach songs to the shepherd & plowman.
I taught the ships of the sea to sing the songs of Zion.
Italy saw me, in sublime astonishment; France was wholly mine,
As my garden & as my secret bath; Spain was my heavenly couch,
I slept in his golden hills; the Lamb of God met me there.¹

Mais enfin vient la Régénération; et les nations, et en particulier
les Juifs, rentrent dans la Jérusalem nouvelle, qui est l'Angleterre. Les
fils de Jérusalem demeurés en Angleterre reconstruisent la cité divine.
Le poète participe à l'œuvre:

Highgate's heights & Hampstead's, to Poplar, Hackney & Bow;
To Islington & Paddington & the Brook of Albion's River.
We builded Jerusalem as a City & a Temple; from Lambeth
We began our Foundations; lovely Lambeth, O lovely Hills.²

¹ *Jerusalem*, p. 79.

² *Ibid.*, p. 84.

Et Los voit et annonce le triomphe suprême, la réintégration de la multiplicité à l'unité, la reconstitution de l'un, le retour en Grande-Bretagne:

So Los terrified cries; trembling & weeping & howling: Beholding.

What do I see! The Briton, Saxon, Roman, Norman amalgamating
In my furnaces into One Nation, the English: & taking refuge
In the Loins of Albion. The Canaanite united with the fugitive
Hebrew, whom she divided into Twelve, & sold into Egypt,
Then scatter'd the Egyptian & Hebrew to the four Winds.¹

Les temps sont accomplis. L'Angleterre s'éveille et va, comme aux temps de la Création, redevenir le monde entier. Etrange impérialisme mystique, où, derrière le fantastique déploiement de l'imagination de Blake, se révèle l'un des traits les plus fondamentaux de la race anglo-saxonne.

Time was Finished! The Breath Divine Breathed over Albion
Beneath the Furnaces & starry Wheels and in the Immortal Tomb,
And England who is Brittannia awoke from Death on Albion's bosom.²

Albion se relève de son sommeil séculaire et devient l'humanité:

. . . . Then Albion stood before Jesus in the Clouds
Of Heaven, Fourfold among the Visions of God in Eternity.

Awake, Awake, Jerusalem! O lovely Emanation of Albion,
Awake, and overspread all Nations as in Ancient Time.
For lo! the Night of Death is past and the Eternal Day
Appears upon our Hills: Awake, Jerusalem, and come away!

So spake the Vision of Albion, & in him so spake in my hearing
The Universal Father. Then Albion stretch'd his hand into Infinitude,
And took his Bow. . . .³

La grande épopée de Blake *Jerusalem* développe d'autres thèmes: la division et la reconstitution de l'Un, les guerres des Sexes, la révolte de l'âme contre le dogme et la morale, etc. Mais le fil conducteur de ce labyrinthe est dans l'histoire légendaire de la terre celtique, telle que les Celtomanes du XVIII^e siècle l'ont conçue. Blake l'a développée, cette histoire, avec son esprit à la fois fantastique et très précis, accablant le lecteur de détails ahurissants, certes, mais d'une logique curieuse. Une fois admise la thèse générale, pourquoi ne pas imaginer

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 92.

² *Ibid.*, p. 94.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 96-97.

les faits les plus complets; pourquoi ne pas diviser les comtés d'Angleterre parmi les tribus d'Israel? Certes, cette théorie n'explique pas tout *Jerusalem*, mais elle aide à en comprendre le schéma général. Pouvons-nous jamais espérer faire davantage? Elle nous aide à comprendre un peu mieux l'enthousiasme du poète, et par conséquent, à jouir avec un peu plus de repos dans l'intelligence de sa merveilleuse poésie, lorsqu'il s'écrie:

And did those feet in ancient time
Walk upon England's mountains green?
And was the holy Lamb of God
On England's pleasant pastures seen?

And did the Countenance Divine
Shine forth upon our clouded hills?
And was Jerusalem builded here
Among these dark Satanic Mills?

Bring me my bow of burning gold!
Bring me my arrows of desire!
Bring me my spear! O clouds, unfold!
Bring me my chariot of fire!

I will not cease from mental fight,
Nor shall my sword sleep in my hand,
Till we have built Jerusalem
In England's green and pleasant land.¹

C'est que Jesus n'est autre que l'Homme primitif et total, reconstitué, et que par conséquent, il a bien pu, à son retour, paraître en Palestine, mais lors de sa première existence, avant la chute, il était Albion. C'est en Angleterre que l'humanité primitive s'est formée, c'est en Angleterre que l'humanité recevra sa consécration. C'est le vieux rêve des Celtomanes qui revit en Blake, et qui dort tout au fond de l'âme anglaise. C'est une parcelle de cette foi en eux-mêmes qui fait les grands peuples.

DENIS SAURAT

LONDON

¹ *Milton*, p. 2.

RHYME AND ALLITERATION IN CARL SPITTELER

From the impetus given by Zarneke to the investigation of modern versification in its various phases, there have appeared countless studies and numerous dissertations concerning themselves with poets, both living and dead, both major and minor. We now find within easy reach scientifically gathered data regarding the practices of the German masters from Goethe and Schiller to Hauptmann and Sudermann. The following pages will be an attempt to cast some light upon a few verse-characteristics of a poet who recently has been so deservedly and signally honored.

RHYME

In the approximately 12,000 verses of *Olympischer Frühling* we find pure and subjectively pleasing rhymes in large majority. Spitteler, however, like the classicists and the moderns in contrast to the Middle High German poets, is occasionally found nodding when face to face with the objective demands of what is generally accepted to be the best rhyme theory. Though disclaiming the presumption of desiring to formulate new ideas, Spitteler¹ wishes to suggest the path which a rational rhyme theory will have to take. The gist of his suggestion is "*dass, was an der einen Stelle ein Vorzug, an der andern Stelle ein Fehler ist,*" when speaking of bad rhymes. This tolerant doctrine has already been championed by the theorists several years before 1910.² Von Cumpfenberg, more liberal than Spitteler, has even established phonetic conditions under which impure rhymes are concealed.³ Even though under the stress of modern life our ear may not be as keenly attuned to the niceties of musical verse as was the case in the best period of the Middle High German masters, still fundamental laws for a work of art in rhyme prevail, and the technical perfection of such a work of art is judged by the observance of infringement of

¹ *Kunstwart*, Vol. XXIV, Part I, p. 35.

² Cf. Minor, *Neuhochdeutsche Metrik*, pp. 392-99.

³ *D. euphon. Gesets d. unrein. Reime AZg. B*, No. 74, extract, *JBGPh* (1899), pp. 125-26; also, *Gesets d. unrein. Reime LE*, I (1899), 898.

such laws. The first of these laws is that the vowel be of the same quantity and quality. Though we remember with Goethe, "*Freilich ist die Poesie nicht fürs Auge gemacht*,"¹ still we must not forget that the modern eye mediates for the ear and that both organs are sensitive to vowel quantity and quality, especially in rhymed couplets.

Opitz declared war on the failure to observe vowel quantity on the part of German poets from Hans Sachs to the seventeenth century, and in practice generally observed the rules of his own theory. Wehnert² and Henkel³ show that Goethe often infringed on quantity when misguided by his own Frankfurt dialect but otherwise seldom. Platen and Gries carefully avoided impure rhymes while Gellert, Schiller, Rückert, Heine, and Sudermann were not so meticulous.

Spitteler, like Goethe, frequently confuses long and short vowels, as in the following (unless otherwise stated, examples are from *Olympischer Frühling*):

ā : *ä*

sah'n : *an*, II, 20a; IV, 63c.

Grab : *ab*, II, 42c, 73c, 97c, 100a, 113b.

Stab : *ab*, II, 38c, 39a.

Bahn : *an*, II, 44b, 49b, 50a, 149a, 159f, etc.

ā : *ä*

ebenmässig : *unablässig*, II, 6b; IV, 51b, *Schmetterlings*, 18c, etc.

ā : *e*

wäre : *Ehre*, II, 2c, 45b, 54b (frequent).

Bär : *daher*, II, 23c.

ā : *e* are too numerous to mention.

Aside from the rhymes *ā* : *e*, Spitteler's most numerous impure rhyme is *i* (*ie*) : *i* (cf. Goethe's *dahin* : *ziehen*):

ziehen : *hin*, I, 124a; III, 7c, 8a, 119a.

ihn : *hin*, I, 89b; III, 146b; IV, 19a, 74a, 38a.

dies : *Nemesis*, I, 50a (but *riss* : *Nemesis*, I, 51b).

dies : *Biss*, III, 148a.

überdies : *gewiss*, I, 98c; II, 124c.

¹ *Ital. Reise*.

² *Dissertation, Goethes Reim*, Berlin, 1899.

³ *GJB*, XXVIII, 231-33.

Spitteler rarely rhymes δ : δ (cf. Goethe's *verlorn* : *vorn* and *davon* : *Hohn*, etc.):

Widerstoss : *Geschoss*, II, 121c.

Astaroth : *Gott*, III, 119b, 119c.

Barathron : *hievon*, II, 97b.

Sohn : *schon* : *davon*, *Schmetterlinge*, 72a.

With \bar{e} : \bar{e} Spitteler is very careful:

wehrts : *Schmerz*, II, 83c.

as also with \bar{u} : \bar{u} :

Wasservüste : *Küste*, I, 78c.

düster : *Geflüster*, *Schmetterlinge*, 77a.

\bar{u} : \bar{u}

fusslen : *mussten*, II, 97a.

Morgenblut : *Lust*, II, II, 46b.

Spitteler is more careful in the quality of the consonant. Due to the lack of voice element in the voiceless and voiced stops of Oberdeutsch we find:

Rhodopen : *erhoben*, II, 117c.

Giganten : *standen*, I, 9c.

verschwunden : *unten*, I, 40b.

The following liquids rhyme badly:

Amt : *benannt*, II, 140c.

verschrumpft : *Kunst*, III, 144c.

Likewise, too:

Staube : *Auge*, *Glockenlieder*, 4c.

Hexenweib : *bleibt*, *Glockenlieder*, 63b.

The rhymes s : ss are frequent, as:

Küste : *wüsste*, I, 118c.

Tasten : *fassten*, II, 3b.

Brust : *bewusst*, II, 8a and elsewhere.

As is perfectly proper, Spitteler does not hesitate to employ secondary accent in rhyme, as:

benedeit : *Ewigkeit*, I, 45a.

Zickzackband : *Niphant*, III, 16c.

Without desiring to enter into the controversy as to the availability of unaccented e for the arsis and for rhyme, a question first raised,

perhaps, by Schottel¹ and argued pro and con by Goethe, W. Schlegel, Bürger, Voss, Lessing, Klopstock, and Platen, I shall say that possibly to his credit Spitteler uses unaccented *e* (*e* : *e*) in rhyme only seven times, as:

schnatterte : *flatterte*, I, 12c.
bejammerte : *kämmerte*, I, 89c.

Syllable inclination in rhymes made possible by syncope, elision, or apocopation is disregarded, as:

empfah'n : *nebendran*, IV, 56c.
Zeus : *freu's*, IV, 39b.
Grün : *blüh'n*, IV, 70c.
frei'n : *sein*, I, 21b.

A source of inartistic rhyming is a simplex and a homogeneous compound. In the case of a preposition in which inorganic *r* is carried over to following syllable, the rhyme is free from objection.

anderswo : *wo*, III, 141b.
gegenüber : *über*, III, 33b.

Little effort is required to rhyme with a repetition of the rhyme word. In rhymed couplets one prefers the element of surprise instead of hearing again the same word, marked by its position, which remains vivid in the memory. Spitteler rarely errs in this:

nicht : *nicht*, III, 117b.
scheiden : *scheiden*, III, 116a.
Stunden : *Stunden*, *Schmetterlinge*, 98c.
ich : *ich*, *Schmetterlinge*, 93c.

The repetition of the same word with different meaning or the repetition of a common member of two compounds in rhyme is without offense if not employed too often. Identical rhyme is defended by Rückert, Lessing, W. Schlegel, J. Grimm, and Hildebrand.

Weh : *weh*, I, 35b.
Recht : *recht*, III, 116c.
wahr : *war*, III, 119c, 153c; IV, 6c, 80b; I, 43a, 66b.
wäre : *währe*, III, 115b, 130c, 131a.
"halt" : *halt*, II, 78a.

¹ *Teutscher Vera- und Reimkunst*, 1645.

When in 1733 a commission was given Gottsched to prepare a festive song for the Weissenfelder court, the hint was added: "*Dass Serenissimus nicht gerne das Wort "Wonne" . . . haben mögen.*"

Herz reimt noch stets auf Schmerz, auf Liebe Triebe—
Ich reimte mit Genuss auf beide—Hiebe [Hartleben].

Spitteler is at pains to avoid trivial rhymes at all times. Of the well-known rhyme pairs, the first of which suggests the sentiment of the verse following it, Spitteler seldom makes use.

Herz : *Schmerz*, I, 35b.
Not : *Todt*, I, 113c, 77b; II, 40a.
Wonne : *Sonne*, III, 95b.
Lieb : *Trieb*, III, 148c.

When used in compounds common rhymes are not noticeable as such:

Not : *Martertod*, I, 80c.
Herzenslust : *Brust*, IV, 28b.
Fern : *Morgenstern*, II, 64a.

Kunow has shown that Goethe used most successfully these abused pairs, and Uhland later removed from his poems trivial rhymes.¹

Every language has "stock" rhymes—words that pair with greatest difficulty with others except of a certain combination and which are still not common enough to be trivial.

Fürsten : *dürsten*, IV, 42c.
Meeresfürsten : *Liebesdürsten*, III, 86c.
dürstet : *gefürstet*, I, 5c.
Töne : *Schöne*, I, 8c.

Needless to state, Spitteler makes use of extended and double rhyme:

frage nicht : *wage nicht*, III, 117b.
bejammerte : *hämmerte*, I, 89c.
Bedrängnis : *Gefängnis*, I, 90a.

R. M. Meyer² points out that noun should rhyme with noun, verb with verb, and adjective with adjective. Lenau prefers noun : noun; Heine, verb : verb; and Uhland likes the two equally well. Since German is essentially a language of root-syllable rhyme in contrast to the Romance group with its system of inflectional endings available for couplets, it is a matter of course that rhyme should stand in close

¹ Minor, p. 385.

² *Über Reimfindung* LE, p. 15.

relationship with textual emphasis. Words of concept denoting similitude or antithesis are to be preferred to the comparatively more unimportant words of relationship. Goethe and Geibel illustrate this well. Spitteler¹ claims that *nannte* : *wandte* give a rhyme of a different carat than do *nannte* : *Verwandte*; in the first case, we have an asservative and in the second a gliding, fleeting rhyme. This is true and for the epic not improper. Still, rhymes with *du*, *als*, *wenn*, etc., are not in this category. In spite of the large number of beautiful couplets, unimportant words in rhyme cannot fail to detract. In a poem in which alliteration is extensively used and in which *enjambement* is not uncommon, rhyme with unimportant words prevents the verse to be felt as an entity, as:

zwar : *wahr*, IV, 103b.

dann : *an*, IV, 102b.

fuhr : *nur*, III, 81c.

The auxiliary *haben* rhymes three times: III, 9c; III, 69c; IV, 97c.

Spitteler avoids the exotic and bizarre in rhyme. He does not hesitate, however, to use proper nouns and words of foreign origin in rhyme. Since the time of Byron and Heine, proper names have been more popular, though such combinations as *Schiller* : *Triller*; *Lessing* : *Messing*; and *Niebuhr* : *Tibur* are to be avoided. *Hutten* : *Kutten* was used by Goethe, Platen, Heine, and Leuthold for its sound as well as thought association. Freiligrath's famous *rohre* : *Sophomore* is approached by Spitteler in several couplets. Our poet, however, frequently obeys Lenau's injunction to let the unusual rhyme word precede, that it might not seem that it was used under pressure to find a suitable rhyme, as:

Prytanen : *Ahnen*, II, 92b frequent.

lohn : *Amazonen*, II, 93b.

Tritanen : *Prytanen*, II, 97a.

Aorist : *Ist*, III, 22b.

Dialect in rhyme, if pure, belongs in discussions concerning themselves with style. Several misprints have been passed over.

Beehren, II, 15c has no rhyme, while in the whole epic there is a total of twenty-six combinations that have three rhyme words: I, 3a, 17b, 82b; II, 26b, 32c, 48b, 146c; III, 3c, 28b, 30b, 41b, 70a, 82b, 91b,

¹ KW, XXIV, L, 35-37.

111c, 116c; IV, 9c, 21c, 34b, 62b, 72c, 73a, 76c, 82b, 85a, 88b. There are two systems of four rhymes: *war : gar*, 16c, 17a; *mich : lich*, II, 110c.

There is nothing unusual or disturbing in Spitteler's apocopation, elision, or syncopation in rhyme.

ALLITERATION

The excessive use of alliteration together with rhyme places Spitteler's *Olympischer Frühling* in a class all its own. Almost every method of harmonizing sounds, almost every combination of harmonious words, is employed.

A very frequently occurring form of alliteration is noun with noun. In the epic we expect and demand the use of those expressive alliterative phrases common to all Germanic languages, as:

Leib und Leben, II, 20b.

Wald und Waide, I, 45c.

Wind und Welle, I, 14c.

Herz und Hemde, II, 9b.

Spitteler employs these in large numbers very effectively, and in addition may use a noun or verb in the same alliterative group or a compound of a different group or use two groups together, as:

eine Wiese "Wachs und Werden," I, 46b.

dem Leibe Leben leicht, I, 2c.

Modermeer von Tümpeln und Teichen, I, 11c.

Herz und Hand und Leib und Leben, 152a.

There is a total of one hundred forty-seven citations of this class, not all of which, however, are connected by conjunctions, as:

Thale Thaumas, I, 19c.

Red' ist Rauch, II, 116b, etc.

Schmetterlinge and *Glockenlieder* show a less pronounced preference for alliteration.

The compound noun frequently shows alliteration, as:

Martermühlen, I, 48b.

Gartengassen, I, 109b.

Herdgehäusen, IV, 8c.

Heuchelhäuschen, IV, 34b.

They may appear in juxtaposition with an alliterating adjective or in pairs, as:

wackern Wind- und Wolkenwart, III, 13c.
Weibsgewäsch und Tintelland, II, 24a, etc.

The noun with its limiting genitive in alliteration is often met with, as:

<i>Der Schiffer Siegesschrei</i> , II, 27b.	<i>des Laubes Lücke</i> , II, 108b.
<i>Des Mannes Minne</i> , I, 50c.	<i>des Weges Wagnis</i> , II, 108c.
<i>der Witz der Weisheit</i> , I, 22a.	<i>des Todes Taufe</i> , II, 33c.

They may appear, too, in various alliterative associations, as:

Tages Abenteuer tauschend, III, 38b.
Lästiger Leute Luftgeschwätz, III, 5a.
Der Wildingswuchs der Ungewöhnlichkeit, II, 87a.

The noun-verb alliterations are found on every page, as:

<i>wälzt der Wahnsinn</i> , II, 18c.	<i>röcheln die Rappen</i> , II, 85a.
<i>schrrieb der Schrecken</i> , II, 25b.	<i>Weihrauch wölkend</i> , II, 105c.
<i>Bosheit beckt</i> , I, 109c.	<i>Weihrauch würgend</i> , II, 107a.

These combinations are often strengthened by additions, as:

schwebt ein schwarzer Schatten, II, 149c.
losch des Abends letztes Licht, II, 120a.
schob die schwere Schlange, III, 49c.
hob die Hände himmelwärts, II, 99b.
Hoheit hat zum Hüter, II, 39a.

Root-repetitions for alliteration appear at times, as:

Sprache sprachen, I, 57b.
Selbstgespräche sprach, II, 74b.
Fühlen fühlen, I, 57b.
Schauspiel schauen, I, 57a.
gezwungen zwang, I, 3a (*gezwungen zwankt*, I, 4c).

The appositive adjective and its noun show the usual manifestation of Spitteler's partiality for alliteration.

wohlgelauntes Loos, II, 118b.
rauhem Rufs, II, 95b.
unbarmherz'gen Bahnen, I, 111b.
flücht'gen Flanken, I, 112b.
erhobne Hämmerkraft, II, 78c.

This combination is strengthened in every possible way, as:

morgenwindbewegten Rebenranken, III, 123b.
der wackre Wind- und Wolkenvater, III, 23b.
unvernünftige näsige Nichtsnutz, III, 15b, etc.

As was the case with the noun alliterative pair, so, too, are all the resources of the language exploited for the adjective - adjective (adverb - adverb) group, as:

<i>schwarz und schwer</i> , II, 104c.	<i>gütig und gelinde</i> , II, 123b.
<i>kühl und keusch</i> , II, 133a.	<i>weich und warm</i> , II, 148b.
<i>so heilig und so hoch</i> , I, 15c.	<i>gewöhnlich und gering</i> , I, 35b.

Compound adjectives (adverbs), too, are not neglected, as *sehnstiech*, 1126a; *regenreich*, I, 74a; *rosenroth*, II, 15b; *lungerlangen Tag* and the following combinations: *schlammerschwer*, I, 91c; *reue-thränentrunknen*, II, 83a; *traumestrunken*, L, 82c; *ehrfurchtfiebernd doch gefasst*, II, 15c, etc.

Alliteration occurs often in verb-verb combinations. These groups, though common, do not appear as frequently as do the noun-noun and adjective - adjective pairs: *denkt und dichtet*, I, 34c; *krächzt und kreischt*, I, 12c; *murrten sie und meuterten*, I, 44a; *speit und sprudelt*, I, 55a; *und hinkt und humpelt herum vor Pein und Plage*, III, 101c, etc.

The verb may alliterate with the adverb frequently, as *entfloh sie flink*, I, 62b; *heiss mich hurtig*, I, 79b; *kleinlaut kroch kniefällig flehend*, II, 38b; *holt hurtig ihn herunter*, III, 110c; *schob sie sachte sich*, III, 117c.

Spitteler often employs word or root repetition for alliterative effect, as *Fluh und Fluh*, I, 19c; *Stuf' um Stufe*, I, 39b; *Wang' an Wange*, II, 53a.

In most of the interjections of three words or more we find alliteration, as *Heissah*, *Happla*, *hupp*, III, 14a; *lallte trallali und la*, III, 23c.

The following lines are, to my knowledge, unique in a German poem of a serious nature. In some lines almost every word in thesis as well as arsis stands in alliteration. Lines like these are numerous.

Doch wachs jetzt nicht so wildlings, denk an deine Wickel, III, 87a.
"Ichor" im Hain Hygieia heisst ein heisser Quell, II, 2c.
Von Mütterlein Natur, der milden Manna Mäh, III, 77b.
Hofft Mitleid, heischt Gehör, hält still gerechter Rache, IV, 78b.

Oh Schlag ins Angesicht! Oh Schmach der schmutz'gen Schande, IV, 96b.
Zum Zweiten hat sie zwischen Zunge zwischen Zahn, III, 127a.
Doch ihrer Schultern Schein, der Schenkel lichter Schimmer, III, 84b.
Hylas nach Hause ziehete, huschten aus dem Hag.
Die Heckenymphen, "Hör doch, Gylas . . . ," III, 126b, etc.

"ENJAMBEMENT"

In spite of the protest of J. A. Schlegel¹ against the use of *enjambement* in rhymed verse on the part of Ramler who followed Drollinger, the break with French classicism even at this early date seemed at least in practice complete. Mendelssohn, too,² joined Schlegel and termed rhyme in run-on lines "*unschicklicher Zierrat*."³ Klopstock, Goethe, and Schelling soon followed Drollinger and his Horacian straddling, and the rhyme-*enjambement* theory was established. Of the moderns, Freiligrath lets the sentence run through from one verse half to the other unhindered, and thereby establishes a new verse.⁴ Aside from the 4-foot iambic strophe, Spitteler follows Freiligrath. He not only allows the sense to run from one verse half to the other but also from verse to verse. In this way Spitteler relieves the epic of a monotony which otherwise would ensue, and definitely establishes his verse as the 6-foot iambus instead of, according to strictest traditions, the Alexandrine.

Though not disregarding the entity of the verse to such an extent as to permit the separation of a compound, as did Goethe⁵ and Schiller,⁶ still Spitteler did not avoid extreme cases of *enjambement*. Krause⁷ claims that von Wildenbruch and Hauptmann used run-on lines sparingly and that "von Hofmannsthal is the Lessing of the Moderns." While Sudermann⁸ occupies a place between Wildenbruch, Hauptmann, and von Hofmannsthal, Spitteler arranges himself between Sudermann and von Hofmannsthal.

A use of *enjambement* that has a distinctly jarring effect and that

¹ *Batteux* (2d ed., 1759), 585.

² *Bibliothek d. schön. Wissenschaften* (1757), p. 1178.

³ Walzel, *AZDA*, XXIII, 86-91.

⁴ Minor, p. 271.

⁵ *Werke, Jub. Ausg.*, XIV, 363.

⁶ Zarncke, *D. fünf Fuss. Jambus durch Lessing, Schiller and Goethe* (Leipzig, 1865), pp. 68, 69.

⁷ Dissertation, *Hauptmann's Verse* (New York, 1910), pp. 60, 61.

⁸ Cannon, *Sudermann's Treatment of Verse* (Tübingen, 1920), pp. 26, 31, 58, 59.

annihilates the verse as a unity is the separation by the verse-end of preposition and noun, as *Ohne/Ansicht*, IV, 21b; *Ohne / Den Purpurmantel*, IV, 33c; *inmitten / Des Menschenvolkes*, IV, 46b; *unterhalb / Der Sonnenreise*, III, 67c.

If we remember in cases of *enjambement* of preposition : noun and adjective : noun that the preposition or adjective is employed in rhyme, we see that strong run-on lines add nothing either to the rhyme or verse unity.

The separation of adjective : noun is next in order of extreme *enjambement*. If, however, the verse-end falls between the first and second of a series of three adjectives, the straddling is much less, if at all, noticeable, as *ein ekler / oder abscheulicher Geruch*. Instances of the separation of adjective from noun are as follows: *der getreue / Gemahl*, III, 4b; *bergumrahmte / Schneewüste*, III, 107b; *ein flüchtig / Gespenst*, III, 129a; *der bedrängte / Gedanke*, IV, 35c, etc.

Among the cases of strong *enjambement* belongs the separation of limiting genitive from its noun. If the genitive precedes and forms the rhyme, the case is particularly jarring, as *des Tigers / Gereizte Rachsucht*, II, 9c. If an adjective precedes the limiting genitive in the second verse, it is less noticeable, as *den Staub / Der sturmgefügten Erde*, III, 25c. Other instances are *in den Schluchten / Des Waldes*, IV, 16a; *Theilen / Des Parks*, IV, 18a; *Heereswurm / Des Lebens*, IV, 21c, 22a; and twenty-eight other citations.

The separation of subject and predicate is a case of milder *enjambement*, as *eine Pause / Vereinigte*, I, 52b; *die Entsetzten / Aufsprangen*, I, 73a; *Amt / Ist*, 73a; *Pfand / ist*, I, 81c.

If the predicate precedes and is separated by the verse-end, the *enjambement* is stronger. Strangely enough, Spitteler has used this form more than that mentioned in the last paragraph, as *kochte / Das Herzblut*, I, 23a; *war / Phineus*, I, 49b; *wetzte / Hebe*, I, 52b; *vergass / Der Mund*, I, 57c; *schnellte / Der Gegenwurf*, I, 77b. The separation of the verb from the pronoun subject is rare. There are eighty other cases in some of which the subject is modified by an adjective, forming a milder *enjambement*, as *dräute / Ein zorn'ger Ausruf*, I 32b.

Alliterative and current phrases forming one idea are occasionally separated in strong *enjambement*, as *bocks / Und stocks*, III, 81c; *Kern / Und Geist*, III, 61a; *mit ja / Und nein*, III, 143a.

A particularly strong form of *enjambement* is the separation of verb and reflexive, as *begab* / *Sich*, II, 6c, III, 20c, *Erbarme* / *Dich*, II, 19b, III 34b; *bückte* / *Sich*, II, 147c; *wandten* / *Sich*, III, 43c; *stellte* / *Sich*, IV, 6a; *schmiegte* / *Sich*, I, 99b; *fieng* / *Sich*, II, 81b.

The separable prefix is rarely divided in *enjambement*, as *fuhr* / *Hinunter*, I, 85c; *wich* / *Zurück*, I, 116b; *kam* / *Vorüber*, II, 126b.

There are a few cases of straddling in verb / object, as *brach* / *Das Schweigen*, II, 20c; *wischte* / *Den Ärmel*, II, 24a; *thaten* / *Die Kleider*, II, 44c; and fewer still of object / verb, as *Gewalt* / *Verschmäht er*, III, 53c.

HARRY S. CANNON

MONTANA STATE COLLEGE

COMPARATIVE SYNTAX AND SOME MODERN THEORIES OF THE SUBJUNCTIVE

Brunot points out the usefulness of careful distinction between relations and modalities in dealing with the subjunctive.¹ Of such relations he mentions as instances those of causality, of finality, and of consecutiveness. Modalities he calls "les relations entre la chose énoncée et notre jugement ou notre sentiment." Save for this hint, he sheds very little light on the actual function of the mood, and concludes that it denotes "tantôt des relations logiques, tantôt des modalités, tantôt il n'est qu'un simple outil de subordination."² He thinks there is disagreement between language and thought in *Que cela soit vrai, j'en conviens*, and in *Il est exact qu'il l'ait vu*. Further, if *Je doute que cela soit vrai* express a doubt, and *Je ne doute pas que cela ne soit vrai* does not express doubt, is not, he asks, the subjunctive, if used in both, illogical in one? From this he concludes that the use in certain cases is purely mechanical.³

Van der Molen, in a valuable chapter entitled "Différentes Conceptions de la Valeur du Subjonctif,"⁴ maintains that it would be misleading to consider *Je ne doute pas* as equivalent in meaning to *Je suis sûr*. But, he continues, if we consider the mental attitude of the speaker and the atmosphere coloring the expression, it is evident that the speaker adopts a firmer, more resolute, and more positive attitude toward the statement if he uses the words *Je suis sûr* than does he who says *Je ne doute pas*, for the latter is not quite convinced, nor absolutely certain of what he is willing to admit for the moment. Psychological analysis, van der Molen contends, can and should supplement logical analysis.

Brunot rightly sees no alteration of the logical relation by the transposition of *Je conviens que cela est vrai* to *Que cela soit vrai, j'en*

¹ F. Brunot, "Le Renouveau nécessaire des méthodes grammaticales." *Revue Universitaire*, October, 1920, and January, 1921.

² *La Pensée et la Langue* (1922), Introduction, p. xv.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 520 ff.

⁴ Willem van der Molen, *Le Subjonctif, sa valeur psychologique et son emploi dans la langue parlée*, Diss., Amsterdam, 1923, chap. 1, p. 16 ff.

[MODERN PHILOLOGY, November, 1925]

conviens. Logical analysis perceives no difference between the two. It is evident then that logical analysis is inadequate for the analysis of language.¹ In *Il est exact qu'il l'ait vu*, the mood will appear less illogical, thinks van der Molen, if we consider the attitude of the speaker, who, not content with stating a fact, expresses it in a conciliatory manner; he makes a concession; he adds a touch of subjectivity that is rendered by the subjunctive. In *Que cela soit vrai, j'en conviens* we have the subjective expression of the thought that is simply, naturally, and neutrally expressed by *Je conviens que cela est vrai*.

En lançant ce membre de phrase en avant ... nous rompons la marche régulière de la pensée discursive, nous mettons en vedette la partie de la phrase qui nous occupe avant tout et qui doit frapper notre interlocuteur, en un mot, nous enveloppons notre phrase d'une atmosphère subjective, qui la colore d'une nuance spéciale; cette phrase appartient au langage affectif.²

Van der Molen, then, would have us seek the modality as the most likely clue to the solution of the modal problem.

Concerning modality, M. Sechehaye's definition: "est modal en grammaire tout ce qui exprime le mode du sujet, c.-à-d. son attitude psychologique à l'égard de l'idée exprimée"³ is almost that of Karl Brugmann: "Die Modi stellten seit urindogermanischer Zeit eine Aussage über eine Seelenstimmung (*ψυχική διάθεση*) des Sprechenden dar, über einen subjektiven Zustand, zu dem die Handlung die objektive Nebenbestimmung bildet, auf die sich dieser Zustand bezieht,"⁴ and that of M. Meillet: "Sous le nom de modes on entend les formes au moyen desquelles est indiquée l'attitude mentale du sujet parlant par rapport au procès indiqué par le verbe,"⁵ which van der Molen further simplifies to: "attitude psychique du sujet parlant par rapport à l'idée énoncée."⁶ The substitution of *psychique* for *psychologique* is, he explains, in order to avoid any possible confusion between the intellectual and the psychological values of forms. Presumably he

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 18.

² *Le Subjonctif*, p. 18.

³ Ch.-Albert Sechehaye, *Programme et Méthodes de la Linguistique théorique*, Paris, 1908, p. 35.

⁴ Karl Brugmann, *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, II, 748.

⁵ A. Meillet, "Sur les caractères du Verbe," *Revue philosophique*, janv.-févr., 1920, pp. 1ff.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 15.

means between thought and feeling, since nearly every case is to be considered in some way or other as affective.

Skeptics as to the rationality of modal usage exist. Besides Brunot's escape in his discovery of disagreement between language and thought, we have Soltmann's opinion that the subjunctive in *Que cela soit vrai, j'en conviens* is required by a "ganz äusserliche und tōrichte Regel."¹ M. Foulet even goes so far as to maintain that in most cases (even in literary language) there is not sufficient difference in sense between the indicative and the subjunctive to explain modal usage.

Et dans la langue de la conversation, où le subjonctif est relativement peu employé, il n'est qu'un simple substitut de l'indicatif, dont l'emploi est régi par des règles traditionnelles et obscures. Si on l'emploie, c'est en vertu d'une convention où il est bien vain de vouloir aujourd'hui retrouver un sens.²

With this encouragement we may now turn to the exponents of what may be termed the "subordination" theory. Venzke's distinction between a *Vorstellungsreihe* and a *Vorstellungskomplex* is most valuable.³ In a series of ideas the indicative is found. But when one idea gives rise to another, and the second fuses into the first (or the first into the second ?), a complex is produced. The process of thought of the speaker is double, yet there results a unity of concept. The subjunctive, Venzke contends, arose through the desire to represent this dual-unity.

Ricken bases his modal theory⁴ on that of Venzke. The subjunctive is the manner of expression of an idea that is formed without independence. An idea is dependent when it is *untergeordnet*, *unterworfen*, and *untergebunden* (subjunct) to a dominant idea, so that it has no independent meaning apart from that dominant idea. There is a beautiful simplicity in his theory, in which the psychic element as an influence affecting the mood apparently has no place. This inner relation of psychological subordination Ricken considers suffi-

¹ H. Soltmann, *Syntax der Modi im modernen Französisch*, Halle, 1914, p. 75.

² L. Foulet, *Petite Syntaxe de l'ancien français*, Paris, 1919, §§ 209, 211.

³ Venzke, "Zur Lehre vom französischen Konjunktiv," *Progr. zum Jahresbericht des Königl. u. Gröningischen Gymnasiums zu Stargard i. P.* Stargard, 1890.

⁴ Wilhelm Ricken, "Subjonctif als einheitlicher 'unterbindender' Modus," *Neueren Sprachen*, XXVIII, 134 ff. See also Ricken's "Eine neue wissenschaftliche Darstellung der Lehre vom Subjonctif für Zwecke der Schule," *Zeits. für franz. Spr. und Litt.*, XXII, 273 ff.

cient in itself to account for the subjunctive mood. He gives a summary of Hasenclever's presentation of the subject, which is largely his own, with one slight but suggestive detail. Hasenclever pointed out that, if we break up a sentence like "Lyons is the largest city that he has seen" into "Lyons is the largest city—he has seen the largest city," it is evident that the clauses cannot be separated without changing the meaning of the whole sentence. They are so placed together as to produce an effect other than that produced by the two separate clauses. The second idea, then, is subordinated to the first, and is closely bound up with it. Then again, the idea of the main clause is closely bound up with that of the dependent clause; by itself it means something quite different. The statement: "Lyons is the greatest city" is relative only, rather than absolute and literal. The dependent clause shows how the statement is to be taken. The subjunctive denotes such relationship (here mutual). So too in *Charles est heureux qu'il ait trouvé son livre*, the idea predicated in the main clause is relative and to be determined only by reference to the idea in the second clause.¹

We may note that this school does not see any affective *nuance* in this strictly logical idea of relativity, although it is not clear that the possibility of modality as a by-product is excluded. These writers consider the subordination of idea as the chief fact that is found along with the subjunctive, but it does not follow that subordination per se is the reason for the use of the subjunctive. The representation of relativity in the example above and the reference of a relative statement to a standard by which the exact application of the statement may be ascertained seems to be the purpose as well as the effect of the whole sentence. The *Vorstellungskomplex* is the initial mental process, and results in psychological subordination, which, let us admit, is denoted in speech by the subjunctive. But the *Vorstellungskomplex* itself, especially if it is expressed in speech, corresponds to an attitude; and it is the intent to express this attitude in regard to a given imagined state or action, rather than the factor of ideal subordination, that is the main fact accompanying the use of the subjunctive.

¹ Ricken here remarks that this is somewhat different from his own thought; he had explained such a case not as two statements of "rejoicing" and "finding," but as one statement of "rejoicing at finding." The main idea, that of *Unterbindung* of thought, he thinks, is the same.

The latest exponent of the "subordination" theory is C. de Boer.¹ Except for the optative notion expressed in main clauses and in the descriptive relative clause the function of the modal element, in his opinion, is always the same, viz., psychological subordination. The effect is determined in each case by the meaning of the verb, the context, the conjunction. Modality represents only one of the causes that contribute to produce such effects. The subjunctive does not express anything in dependent clauses, but only indicates psychological subordination. He conceives of the principal clause as having subordinating force. If this force is strong, the subordination is effected (or denoted ?) by the subjunctive, and the subordinate clause is colored with the same modality as the principal clause. Thus, if as subordinating force the principal clause contain a strong negative element, the effect of the subordination is a negative one, although slight (example: *Je ne savais pas qu'il eût un père*).² Likewise in *Je cherche une maison qui ait six chambres* the sense of the verb *chercher* and the subordination of the idea expressed by the subjunctive are enough to produce the effect known as *la qualité requise*, but which the subjunctive does not and cannot express.³ In other words, the subordinating force of the main clause being volitive, the effect of the subordination must be a volitive connotation. Against the idea of the subjunctive having any particular force in itself he uses this argument: Of *Dites-lui de venir*, which is equivalent to *Dites-lui qu'il vienne*, we do not say that *venir* is an *infinitivus optativus*; why then speak of *viene* as *subjunctivus optativus*? The infinitive like the subjunctive serves here to subordinate the idea, and this subordination in the context, i.e., together with other elements, suffices to produce the desired effect. Again, if in *On mange pour qu'on puisse vivre*, the subjunctive alone expresses volitive purpose, does the same verbal phrase *puisse vivre* in *bien qu'il puisse vivre* express by itself concession? Surely the conjunction in each case determines the force of the verb.⁴ In the two sentences: *Coutât-il tout le sang qu'Hélène a fait répandre, je ne balance point*, and *Lui restât-il un soupçon, un seul, elle était perdue!* he thinks the subjunctive serves only to subordinate, and that this subordination plus the inversion plus the context all together suggest the ideas of

¹ *Essais de Syntaxe française moderne*, Paris et Groningue, 1923.

² *Ibid.*, p. 93.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 86.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 87.

cient in itself to account for the subjunctive mood. He gives a summary of Hasenclever's presentation of the subject, which is largely his own, with one slight but suggestive detail. Hasenclever pointed out that, if we break up a sentence like "Lyons is the largest city that he has seen" into "Lyons is the largest city—he has seen the largest city," it is evident that the clauses cannot be separated without changing the meaning of the whole sentence. They are so placed together as to produce an effect other than that produced by the two separate clauses. The second idea, then, is subordinated to the first, and is closely bound up with it. Then again, the idea of the main clause is closely bound up with that of the dependent clause; by itself it means something quite different. The statement: "Lyons is the greatest city" is relative only, rather than absolute and literal. The dependent clause shows how the statement is to be taken. The subjunctive denotes such relationship (here mutual). So too in *Charles est heureux qu'il ait trouvé son livre*, the idea predicated in the main clause is relative and to be determined only by reference to the idea in the second clause.¹

We may note that this school does not see any affective *nuance* in this strictly logical idea of relativity, although it is not clear that the possibility of modality as a by-product is excluded. These writers consider the subordination of idea as the chief fact that is found along with the subjunctive, but it does not follow that subordination per se is the reason for the use of the subjunctive. The representation of relativity in the example above and the reference of a relative statement to a standard by which the exact application of the statement may be ascertained seems to be the purpose as well as the effect of the whole sentence. The *Vorstellungskomplex* is the initial mental process, and results in psychological subordination, which, let us admit, is denoted in speech by the subjunctive. But the *Vorstellungskomplex* itself, especially if it is expressed in speech, corresponds to an attitude; and it is the intent to express this attitude in regard to a given imagined state or action, rather than the factor of ideal subordination, that is the main fact accompanying the use of the subjunctive.

¹ Ricken here remarks that this is somewhat different from his own thought; he had explained such a case not as two statements of "rejoicing" and "finding," but as one statement of "rejoicing at finding." The main idea, that of *Unterbindung* of thought, he thinks, is the same.

The latest exponent of the "subordination" theory is C. de Boer.¹ Except for the optative notion expressed in main clauses and in the descriptive relative clause the function of the modal element, in his opinion, is always the same, viz., psychological subordination. The effect is determined in each case by the meaning of the verb, the context, the conjunction. Modality represents only one of the causes that contribute to produce such effects. The subjunctive does not express anything in dependent clauses, but only indicates psychological subordination. He conceives of the principal clause as having subordinating force. If this force is strong, the subordination is effected (or denoted ?) by the subjunctive, and the subordinate clause is colored with the same modality as the principal clause. Thus, if as subordinating force the principal clause contain a strong negative element, the effect of the subordination is a negative one, although slight (example: *Je ne savais pas qu'il eût un père*).² Likewise in *Je cherche une maison qui ait six chambres* the sense of the verb *chercher* and the subordination of the idea expressed by the subjunctive are enough to produce the effect known as *la qualité requise*, but which the subjunctive does not and cannot express.³ In other words, the subordinating force of the main clause being volitive, the effect of the subordination must be a volitive connotation. Against the idea of the subjunctive having any particular force in itself he uses this argument: Of *Dites-lui de venir*, which is equivalent to *Dites-lui qu'il vienne*, we do not say that *venir* is an *infinitivus optativus*; why then speak of *viene* as *subjunctivus optativus*? The infinitive like the subjunctive serves here to subordinate the idea, and this subordination in the context, i.e., together with other elements, suffices to produce the desired effect. Again, if in *On mange pour qu'on puisse vivre*, the subjunctive alone expresses volitive purpose, does the same verbal phrase *puisse vivre* in *bien qu'il puisse vivre* express by itself concession? Surely the conjunction in each case determines the force of the verb.⁴ In the two sentences: *Coutât-il tout le sang qu'Hélène a fait répandre, je ne balance point*, and *Lui restât-il un soupçon, un seul, elle était perdue!* he thinks the subjunctive serves only to subordinate, and that this subordination plus the inversion plus the context all together suggest the ideas of

¹ *Essai de Syntaxe française moderne*, Paris et Groningue, 1923.

² *Ibid.*, p. 93.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 86.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 87.

concession and of unreal condition. Without these elements it is indeed difficult to see how the force of the mood in these two cases could be distinguished; which of course does not prove that the mood has no force. I hope to prove toward the end of this article that it often has a definite force.

A fuller idea of M. de Boer's theory may be gained from the following passage:

Dans une *analyse complète* ... il faudrait commencer, pour chaque cas, par formuler la règle, c.-à-d. par établir le rapport entre la communauté et l'individu. On verrait alors si la règle formulée est une véritable règle, ou seulement une application d'une règle plus générale. Ensuite il faudrait déterminer dans chaque règle la part de l'élément psychologique et de l'élément conventionnel, formel. Enfin il faudrait déterminer la nuance, c.-à-d. l'effet produit et voulu par la subordination. Dans une *description complète*, des "Remarques" pourraient servir à faire des observations historiques, stylistiques (p.e. mesurer dans chaque *exemple* la force de la psychologie *individuelle*, dépendant du plus ou moins de liberté que la communauté laisse à l'individu et des besoins stylistiques de l'individu), des comparaisons avec d'autres langues, etc.¹

If subordination of idea is discoverable in a dependent clause, De Boer invariably refers such subordination to the feeling of the "community" that such and such an expression in the main clause has subordinating force. Now it seems that such phrases express mental attitudes or feelings, if ever so slightly; therefore we are referred ultimately to the affective-psychological element in his attempt to explain modal choice.

The issue between De Boer and his critic van der Molen, who advocates the "psychological" or "psychic" explanation, seems to come to this: Does the subjunctive in the dependent clause express the nuance, or is the nuance of the context communicated to the dependent clause through the subordinating force of the context? That the nuance is connoted, and not actually expressed by the subjunctive, appears to be a satisfactory working hypothesis, which does not, however, preclude the possibility of the mood having some force.

Van der Molen² particularly criticizes De Boer's reiterated statements that "la grammaire, la communauté, la règle moderne exige, impose, prescrit, permet, préfère ou défend la subordination psycho-

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 89

² *Op. cit.*, p. 27.

logique ou subordination d'idée," and that "la subordination psychologique est obligatoire dans tel et tel cas" and thinks that the substitution of "subjunctive" for "psychological subordination" would not alter the value of such utterances. However, as psychological subordination depends on the subordinating force of the idea of the principal, which in turn depends on the psychological situation, i.e., the preponderance of the subjective or negative element in the predication, it is fairly plain that De Boer refers us ultimately to the very same element as does van der Molen, viz., subjectivity.

Van der Molen sees no difference in the force of *dites* in the two sentences *Dites-lui qu'il vienne*, and *Dites-lui qu'il doit venir*.¹ Surely "tell" in its primary sense is declarative, and only volitive when by the context or situation it is clearly imperative. In the second sentence, *doit* is sufficient to express the volition, and clearly *dites* in that sentence is declarative. If imperative, as it is in the first sentence, it has, according to De Boer, subordinating force. Van der Molen's objection then remains without much force.

Of *Je cherche une maison où il y ait dix chambres* and *Je cherche une maison qui doit avoir, qui aura, qui aurait dix chambres* De Boer had said, "La communauté permet au besoin l'indépendance psychologique; la nuance volitive est introduite alors dans la relative par une forme spéciale: futur, conditionnel, verbe auxiliaire." Van der Molen wonders why volition can be expressed by the conditional and not by the subjunctive, and he even doubts if in this sentence with the verb in the conditional there is really psychological independence, since as De Boer says, "la relative forme psychologiquement un tout avec l'antécédent."² Why not then regard *aurait* as the equivalent of (*il y*) *ait*? Is it not possible to see in this *conditionnel* clause³ a case of subordination and of volition being expressed by the context plus the subordination, and accompanied by the *conditionnel* instead of the subjunctive? Perhaps we should admit that the auxiliary *doit* expresses volition; then in the first sentence *je cherche* means "I wish to find," and in the second sentence, since volition is sufficiently expressed by *doit*, *je cherche* is simply declarative.

De Boer had explained the subjunctive in *Je ne savais pas qu'il eût un frère* as due to the subordinating power of the principal which

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 107.

³ A further reason will appear later.

contains a strong negative element. Van der Molen asks if *ne savais pas* in *Je ne savais pas qu'il avait un frère* has not the same negative element. The obvious answer is that while the latter has a negative element, it is not the *same* negative element, for *savais* is all that is negated here, whereas in the former sentence there is implied a doubt of any force amounting to a denial of the action stated in the dependent clause. The psychological situation in the two sentences, then, is different. While van der Molen criticizes De Boer's analysis of many cases, his main objection is evidently to the explanation of the subjunctive as determined by psychological subordination. According to De Boer's theory, as we have seen, the subordinating force of the idea of the principal depends on the psychological situation, i.e., the preponderance of the subjective or negative element in the predication, and subordination of the idea of the dependent clause causes such subjective or negative element to be infused throughout the whole sentence.

With M. van der Molen the subjunctive is simply the mood of subjectivity.

Ce mode a pour effet de teindre l'action de cette nuance subjective qui est inhérente au mode subjonctif, partout et toujours, aussi bien dans la proposition principale que dans la subordonnée. Autour du sens logique du verbe flotte une atmosphère sentimentale qui l'enveloppe, le pénètre, et lui donne, suivant le contexte, des colorations particulières; ce sera tantôt un ordre ou une prière, tantôt une certaine réserve ou hésitation, dictée par la politesse ou la prudence, tantôt une certaine bienveillance, une concession en faveur de l'interlocuteur, tantôt un désir ou une crainte de voir se réaliser l'action; mais on ne perdra jamais de vue que ce sont là autant d'attitudes psychiques du sujet parlant, et que l'élément commun est celui de la subjectivité. Grâce à ce caractère subjectif du mode, il se mêle à la notion abstraite et générale qu'exprime le verbe, une nuance particulière, affective, expressive. Entre ces nuances il y aura des transitions comme dans le spectre solaire, mais non pas des différences tranchées et irréductibles. Ainsi le subjonctif se trouve avoir moins de fonctions et de significations que les logiciens ont voulu lui prêter, mais nous lui laisserons sa valeur modale, psychologique. S'il était permis d'appliquer à notre sujet une image empruntée au philosophe Bergson,¹ nous pourrions dire que la forme du subjonctif dessine autour de la représentation intellectuelle proprement dite une frange indistincte et floue; le subjonctif est comme la nébulosité vague, faite d'émotivité, qui entoure un noyau lumineux, notre pensée conceptuelle et logique.²

¹ *L'Évolution créatrice*, p. 50.

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 36, 37.

We have seen that this writer has defined the moods¹ as the forms by means of which is indicated the *psychic* attitude of the speaker with regard to the idea presented. He preferred "psychique" to the "mentale" of M. Meillet.² The reason now is plain. The affective element, rather than intellectual processes, he associates largely with the subjunctive. As "attitudes psychiques" are definitely adopted, and are not vaguely fluctuating emotion, the majority of the modalities could be called psychic; for the rest, the author does not ignore the part played by convention and tradition in syntax,³ although he believes that a psychological basis could always be found.⁴

As regards the function of the subjunctive, we gather that the mood itself overcasts with a subjective hue the action represented; that the subjunctive mood is actually the means of mingling the special affective expressive tone with the abstract general notion expressed by the verb; and that the only value of the subjunctive is psychologic or rather psychic.

Contrasting this with the theory of De Boer, we find that, whereas the latter is of the opinion that as a subordinating instrument the subjunctive is the means of casting by reflection over the whole sentence the modality of a principal, van der Molen prefers the view that the subjunctive, not by virtue of any subordinating power, but by its own power of expressing subjectivity reflects the modality of the principal upon the dependent clause.

Fortunately we have besides the passage quoted above, another,⁵ in which M. van der Molen admits that the subjective-affective interpretation will not meet every case. With M. de Boer he recognizes a formal, conventional, traditional element in syntax, the importance of which, however, should not be exaggerated to the point of forming a purely mechanical conception of language. Beside the comparatively fixed, conventional or organized element, one must admit an active individual element. The obscure, apparently illogical character of some of the traditional rules he considers due to confusion between logical relations and modalities. Moreover, he believes that there must be a psychological basis for even the conventional and

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 15.

² *Ibid.*, p. 1 ff.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 40.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 39.

traditional. "La 'racine psychologique' du subjonctif est partout la même: l'action se présente toujours sous un aspect subjectif."¹

The theories of three of the more recent German writers on modal syntax may now be summarized. In the latest work of J. Haas² the subjunctive is represented as the mood of unreality. He distinguishes³ between unreality that is equivalent to non-existence, and unreality that is a modification, an altered concept of reality due to some state of consciousness that may be conditioned by other ideas or by a psychic condition. For the latter kind it might be suggested that imaginative representation (*Vorstellung*) is a more exactly descriptive term. It seems more appropriate also, since the author recognizes the *Vorstellungskomplex* that underlies the use of the mood. Clinging to this idea of unreality, Haas calls illogical all uses of the subjunctive where the state or action represented corresponds to objective fact.

In Soltmann's work⁴ the idea of uncertainty is held to underlie the use of the subjunctive. The author distinguishes⁵ three degrees of uncertainty felt by the speaker regarding the stated content: (1) real uncertainty, (2) uncertainty because the content is merely assumed, (3) uncertainty assumed for the sake of caution, i.e., where the content is real, but is recognized as likely to be questioned. Approximately, the indicative is the mood of certainty, the subjunctive that of uncertainty, while the imperative is that of will.⁶ In actual practice, however, the distinction is not sharply drawn.⁷ Illustrating the exchange of function, he notes that several types of uncertainty are expressed by the indicative, e.g.: *L'aimerais-je? se demanda-t-elle* (doubt); *Où donc est Malène? Elle aura voulu prendre l'air* (supposition); *Je ne saurais vous le dire* (caution); also that the uncertain element present with desire leads to the use of the subjunctive and the future (the forms associated with uncertainty) as means of *Willensspiegelung*.

An obvious objection to this theory is that there are cases of the use of the subjunctive where no uncertainty of any kind—not even

¹ van der Molen, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

² J. Haas, *Französische Syntax*, Halle, 1916, § 457.

³ *Ibid.*, § 458.

⁴ H. Soltmann, *Syntax der Modi im modernen Französisch*, Halle, 1914, § 4.

⁵ *Ibid.*, § 9.

⁶ *Ibid.*, § 7.

⁷ *Ibid.*, § 8.

of the author's third class—can be imagined directly or indirectly on the part of the speaker or the listener. No amount of ingenious argument can reduce the subjunctive in clauses adversative, causal, and concessive of fact to this single principle.

Unlike the above-mentioned German writers of the psychological school, Eugen Lerch in his earlier work¹ bases his theory upon functional distinctions in Latin. He argues that since the functions of the Greek subjunctive and optative were combined in the Latin subjunctive, the subjunctive in Romance languages must perform two main functions. J. H. Schmalz,² basing his classification on that of Eduard Bottek,³ reduced these functions to five, which Lerch arranges according to the negation used, as follows: *ne*: *hortativus, optativus, concessivus*; *non*: *deliberativus, potentialis*. The first (*ne*) class, he considers, expresses desire, the second (*non*) uncertainty.

Van der Molen attacks this theory by quoting M. Meillet,⁴ who explains the fusion of the optative and the subjunctive into one mood thus:

Optatif et subjonctif s'équivalent, et l'un des deux devait disparaître ... l'histoire de toutes les langues indo-européennes montre que le subjonctif et l'optatif n'ont pu se maintenir à la fois,

and that

l'existence de deux modes distincts, de sens assez voisins et tous deux opposés au mode qui indique le fait positif, l'indicatif, ne se rencontre que dans la période ancienne des deux langues indo-européennes attestées par les textes de la date la plus haute, à savoir, l'indo-iranien et le grec. ... En latin, seuls des restes de l'optatif, comme *sit vellet*, sont entrés dans la catégorie du subjonctif;

all of which really has little to do with the question.

What interests us more than the reduction in the number of the mood-forms and the reason for this reduction is the question whether the main functions of the older optative and subjunctive are operative in the Latin subjunctive. William Gardner Hale tells us that they are.⁵

¹ Eugen Lerch, *Die Bedeutung der Modi im Französischen*, Leipzig, 1919, pp. 10 ff.

² J. H. Schmalz, *Lateinische Grammatik*, in *Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, II, 476 ff.

³ *Die ursprüngliche Bedeutung des Konjunktivs in lateinischen Nebensätzen*, Vienna, 1899.

⁴ Meillet, *Aperçu d'une Histoire de la Langue grecque*, 2d ed., Paris, 1920, pp. 200-14.

⁵ William Gardner Hale, "The Harmonizing of Grammatical Nomenclature, with Special Reference to Mood-Syntax," *P.M.L.A.*, XXVIII, 437.

After speaking of constructions that may be called the inherited subjunctive or optative, which are, he says, generally speaking, common to all the languages under consideration (i.e., the commoner school languages), at least in the fundamental powers which appear in them, and after mentioning the special Latin developments with certain Romance descendents, in which the subjunctive expresses facts, he says: "The subjunctive of the speech from which all the languages under consideration are descended, expressed either volition or anticipation. ... The optative of the parent speech expressed wish, obligation, natural likelihood, possibility, or ideal certainty." Now these very functions of both moods of the older speech are the functional divisions that are found in his classification of the Latin subjunctive,¹ as well as in his scheme of leading mood-ideas found at the end of the above-mentioned article.

Further, Hale observes that of all the languages in which the subjunctive and the optative have fallen together into a single group of mood-forms, Latin alone presents us with any means of external distinction among mood-forces: its negative for volition and wish is *ne*, for all other forces the negative is *non* (in the expression of obligation-propriety, however, either negative may be employed); and that this partition cuts across the two moods, not between them. Now, Hale logically analyzes the so-called *potentialis*, and discovers in it the mood-ideas: natural likelihood, possibility, and ideal certainty; possibly some cases of anticipation would also be classified under this heading, while others would come under the *deliberativus*.

As Schmalz probably regarded obligation-propriety as volitive (which it often is not), and his *hortativus* and *concessivus* are volitive, we shall see that his classification approximates that of Hale. The latter, it is true, in his grammar,² calls the *deliberativus* volitive. Its negative, however, is *non*; therefore by his other statement quoted above it may be here considered other than volitive or optative, and we will class it as such. (It really involves the idea of propriety.)

With this explanation, the identity of the two schemes as given below will be clear.

Schmalz gives: *ne: hortativus, optativus, concessivus; non: delibera-*

¹ Hale and Buck, *Latin Grammar*, Boston and London, 1903, pp. 257-58.

² *Op. cit.*, § 503.

tivus, *potentialis*. Hale gives: *ne*: volition, wish, and (seldom) obligation-propriety; *non*: anticipation, possibility, natural likelihood, ideal certainty, and (usually) obligation-propriety. Now, Lerch states that uncertainty is expressed in all cases of the second (*non*) class. A glance at Hale's classification above will show that natural likelihood and ideal certainty, two definite mood-ideas of the mis-called *potentialis* in Latin, are ideas distinctly opposed to uncertainty.

Lerch later realized the inadequacy of the term "uncertainty." Clearly with him, as with Soltmann, the term "uncertainty" does not connote merely the modality "uncertainty," nor to Haas does "unreality" connote merely mental reserve. Much confusion and controversy might have been spared, had they simply used the term *Vorstellung*, i.e., mental representation, a term consistent with the views of Armstrong,¹ Clédat,² Kalepky,³ A. Wallensköld,⁴ and Gildersleeve and Lodge.⁵

For Lerch's reconsidered view of the subjunctive, no more need here be said than that for the subjunctive of "uncertainty" he has substituted that of the "psychological subject" (the idea about which something is predicated), for the discovery of which he employs an analysis resembling that used by Venzke, Ricken, Hasenclever, and De Boer to discover psychological subordination; and that the single volitive principle underlies every use of the subjunctive.⁶

After professing to discover two distinct functions in Latin and Romance alike, and two only, this *volte-face* is surprising, the more so as the "psychological subject" is offered merely as a substitute for the "subjunctive of uncertainty." Can anyone discern the slightest tinge of volition in the *potentialis* class of Schmalz, which Hale more correctly divided into the mood-ideas of natural likelihood, possibility, and ideal certainty, in statements of which surely the mental attitude of the speaker is neutral?

Then again, certain categories included in the volitive class in Lerch's first theory are open to criticism. The impersonal verb *il faut*

¹ *Syntax of the French Verb*, New York, 1915, p. 51.

² *Rev. de phil. fr.*, 1923.

³ *Zeits. f. rom. Phil.*, XVIII, 165.

⁴ *Neuphilol. Mitteilungen*, 1919, p. 125.

⁵ *Latin Grammar*, Boston, 1907, § 255.

⁶ For discussion see the present writer's "Finite Modal Usage in Dante's Italian Prose," Diss. Chicago, 1925, pp. xxv-xxix.

cannot generally be said to express *Begehren*,¹ although there are cases where it may do so; usually it is only an expression of obligation or propriety. Hale's distinction between volition and obligation-propriety is sound. *Il est juste* is of the latter and not the former class; it expresses opinion. It is true that a statement of opinion is often an expression of approval or disapproval, and we often approve what we desire. But we sometimes desire what our judgment does not approve. If then a judgment is not invariably volitive, this class of expressions should not be termed volitive.

The reference of functional classification to historic mood-ideas advocated by Lerch, Spitzer, and others was a distinct advance. No acknowledgment of indebtedness, however, has been made by any of these writers to Hale, who formulated the method eight years before the appearance of *Die Bedeutung der Modi* and of the *Syntaxe historique du français* of K. Sneyders de Vogel.²

We may now inquire into the actual value of a diachronic study of modal syntax. Is there in the ancient languages any evidence of the original unity of modal function to justify the single-principle theories of these writers? In other words, can the mood-ideas developed and associated with the subjunctive and optative mood-forms be traced to an original single function? Giles writes:

The original meaning of these moods and the history of their development is the most difficult of the many vexed questions of comparative syntax ... In later treatises Delbrück has to some extent modified his view of the development of these moods, and now admits that it is impossible to trace certainly all uses of the subjunctive to the original notion of will or desire that something should or should not take place, or all uses of the optative to the original idea of wish.³

Some authorities oppose Delbrück's view, holding that "the subjunctive was originally and essentially a form for expressing future time, which the Greek inherited, with its subdivisions into an absolute future negated by *οὐ*, and a hortatory future negated by *μη*, and used in independent sentences,"⁴ while the primitive optative also, "before it came into the Greek language was a weak future form, like 'he may go,' and 'may he go,' from which on one side came its potential use and on the other side its use in exhortations and wishes. These uses would naturally all be established before

¹ *Bedeutung der Modi*, p. 26.

² Groningue, La Haye, 1919.

³ *Manual of Comparative Philology*, London, 1901, § 556.

⁴ Goodwin, *Moods and Tenses*, 1889, p. 375.

there was any occasion to express either an unreal condition or an unattained wish."¹

Giles observes that while Goodwin thus surmised an original future and Delbrück an original expression of desire (since will and wish meet in the higher conception of desire), some important original distinction might be fairly supposed to be implied by the differences of stem and person suffixes in the two moods.² It should be observed that Delbrück's theory was later so modified as to agree with Hale's distinction between the volitive and anticipatory subjunctive,³ so that it could no longer serve as a basis for Lerch's single-principle theory of *Begehren*. Goodwin's theory of a future force, hortatory and weaker belonging to the original subjunctive and optative respectively, will presently be seen to support the view that two important classes of subjunctive verbs have future force; nor will it be adverse to the theory that all dependent subjunctive verbs perform the primary function of purposive imaginative representation.

It is of less importance to know in what order the volitive, deliberative, and prospective functions of the subjunctive developed in ancient speech, or the time-relation of *Vorstellung* to wish in the optative (both apparently still open questions),⁴ than to know the mood-ideas themselves associated with the ancient subjunctive and optative, and of their practical identity with the mood-ideas associated with the Latin and Romance subjunctive.

First, then, the subjunctive served in the parent speech to express futurity.⁵ The anticipatory force is especially strong in Latin; the futures even go back to the subjunctive forms. In Old Latin the subjunctive forms at times even take on an absolute future meaning; cf. *Nec me miserior femina est neque ulla videatur magis* (Plaut. *Am.* 1060). In Homer "we find a considerable use also of the independent subjunctive,⁶ in the approximate sense of a future indicative. So do we along with the dependent subjunctive of the same force, in Vedic Sanskrit, Old Persian, and Avestan." Cf. οὐ γὰρ πω τοίους ἴδον ἀνέρας οὐδέ ἴδωμαι (*Il.* A 262) and in Attic Greek: τί πάθω; (Plato *Euth.*

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 388.

² *Op. cit.*, § 557.

³ Delbrück, *Vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, IV, *Syntax II*, Strassburg, 1897, p. 368.

⁴ F. Sommer, *Vergleichende Syntax der Schulsprachen*, Leipzig and Berlin, 1921, 483, III.

⁵ *Ibid.*, §§ 71, 82.

⁶ Hale, *op. cit.*, *P.M.L.A.*, 1911, p. 409.

302d) cited by Sommer.¹ In the ancient languages, then, the subjunctive and the future were often identified.

A future force is also seen in the volitive deliberatives:

τί ποιῶ, *quid faciam?* What shall I do? εἴπωμεν ἢ σιγῶμεν; in the volitive indignant questions: —μηδ' . . . ἔρωμαι, I shall not even ask? *huic cedamus?* Again, in exhortations and prohibitions the willing or not willing of a future action is expressed:

residamus, si placet;
ne dubitaris mittere.

In the expression of will, in the indignant question, and in the deliberative, then, the force is clearly of the vivid future kind.

In dependent volitive clauses the same vivid force is seen: *saepe stilum vertas, iterum quae digna legi sint scripturas; librum peto a te ita corrigas ne mihi noceat; ne filii quidem hoc nostri resciscant volo* ("that not even our sons shall hear of this"); *timeo ne non impetrem* ("that I shall not get what I ask for"). Evidently the vivid future force in these examples is the same as in the anticipatory clause "many a day will dawn before he *shall obtain* his freedom." Nor is a different force discernible in the indirect deliberative question: *est certum quid respondeam*.

On the other hand, we find in independent clauses expressing certain other modalities a future force of a less vivid kind. Such force is seen in expressions of realizable wish: *sint beati*; in optative paratactic conditions: *naturam expellas furca, tamen usque recurret*; in expressions of obligation or propriety: *legibus non recedamus*, as in the Greek prescriptive of similar modality: τῷ μὴ τις ποτε πάμπαν ἀνὴρ ἀθεμίστιος εἴη ἀλλ' ὅ γε σιγῇ δῶρα θεῶν ἔχοι, "therefore (it is meet that) a man should never be impious, but that he should accept in silence the gifts of the gods"; and even in the Vedic: *dāmpatē açñiyātām*, "let the master and the mistress of the house eat"; in expressions of natural likelihood: *quare desinat esse macer?* of intentional modesty: *hoc sine ulla dubitatione confirmaverim*; of possibility: *aliquis dicat mihi*; εἴποι ἂν τις ἡ ἐμὴ (σοφία) φάβλη τις ἂν εἴη (Plato *Symp.* 175e); of ideal certainty: *ire per ignis et gladios ausim*.

One and the same less vivid future force is in all the foregoing sentences. Nor is it plain how anything but the mood-form itself could

¹ F. Sommer, *op. cit.*, § 84.

be the instrument of these effects (modalities). Evidently the sense and feeling of the context serve as sure guides to the modality, but the mood itself in all the independent clauses given above expresses the modality: in these cases the attitude of the speaker in regard to what is viewed as merely possible in the future.

Turning to dependent clauses after optative expressions, we may discern the same less vivid future force: *optemus ut eat in exilium*, as in concessions of indifference: *haec sint falsa sane, invidiosa certe non sunt*; in imaginative comparisons not plainly contrary to fact: *tamquam si claudus sim*, "just as if I might be lame"; in comparative clauses: *perpressus est omnia potius quam conscios indicaret*; in less vivid future conditions: *nihil enim proficiant nisi admodum mentiantur*; in generalizing conditions: *philosophia, cui qui pareat, omne tempus aetatis sine molestia possit degere*; in clauses of proviso: *oderint dum metuant*; after expressions of obligation or propriety: *nihil est quod pocula laudes*; after expressions of natural likelihood: *quantumvis quare sit macer invenies*; after expressions of possibility: *est unde haec fiant*; after expressions of ideal certainty: *nil est aeque quod faciam lubens*.

Of the independent types previously mentioned, the volitive and the optative have survived, and are in full vigor in Romance.

Of independent clauses other than volitive or optative, the only survival in Romance is probably that of softened statement (in the French *je ne sache*). The other types are rendered with the aid of auxiliary verbs, by the future indicative, the so-called conditional, or in a paraphrase such as the equivalent of *fieri potest ut*.

Of the preceding dependent types of subjunctive clauses, practically all have survived in Romance; functionally they are identical with the Latin types, which, as has been seen, have a future force of a more or less vivid nature. How is it possible to deny the same force to the subjunctive in these Romance clauses? The recognition of this force, which is the power of imaginative projection into the future, does not of course preclude classification on the basis of modality to be determined by the context. Indeed, this power, being anticipatory, is a modality of a secondary kind. It is possible to classify on the basis of the primary modality, and further to classify according to the degree of futurity involved in the imaginative process.

But we find the subjunctive in many types of clauses, the content of which is real. Imaginative projection into the future is here out of the question, for such clauses deal with fact present or past. This class of subjunctive clauses is found largely, but by no means exclusively, in formal reasoning. In such cases the subjunctive seems to be the sign of imaginative representation of a fact that is offered for judgment, or of a state or action that is considered in connection with some judgment. Furthermore, in this class of clauses of actual content is found the type in which facts are represented as contingent, i.e., dependent upon chance, possibly because of uncertainty before the event. This last is a Latin type: *accidit ut esset luna plena*.¹

Not unrelated to this type is that of the fact represented as having stirred some feeling. It might be argued that for a fact to excite emotion it could not have been entirely expected, or at least wholly realized, or accepted in advance with a complete resignation amounting to philosophic insensibility. The realization of what before had not been envisaged as inevitably actual results in a complex which demands the imaginative representation of the fact in the expression of the emotional attitude towards it. Yet because of the actual content of such clauses, it seems better to class them with others representing fact.

A last group of clauses of unreal content for more obvious reasons contain a subjunctive verb. Corresponding to the use of the ancient optative to represent imaginatively unreal states or actions (cf. *εἴθε' ὥς ἡβώοιμι*, "I wish I were still young"), is the function of pure *Vorstellung* of the Romance subjunctive in all clauses that stand with expressions that imply a doubt as to the reality of the content of the clause.

Thus the subjunctive seems to possess the primary function of purposive imaginative representation, in the performance of which in certain cases the force of anticipation of a more or less vivid kind is present. In independent subjunctive verbs the modality as well as this anticipatory force is evidently operative. As regards dependent

¹ Armstrong (*op. cit.*, p. 73), discussing clauses of result, points out that the indicative is employed when the result is looked on as something which actually happens; the subjunctive when it is looked on as something which tends to happen. While this is true of one type (cf. *Filosofia è quando l'anima e la sapienza sono fatte amiche, sì che l'una sia tutta amata da l'altra*, Dante, *Conv.* III, xii, 4), yet it does not explain the type *accidit ut esset luna plena*.

clauses, although the modality is sufficiently expressed in the context, it is not impossible that the subjunctive should connote or reflect such modality; through lack of evidence, it seems impossible to decide whether this is so, or whether the sole purpose of the subjunctive in dependent clauses is imaginative representation that frequently involves a mental projection into the future. The subjunctive is also the instrument of intentional imaginative representation of facts, as well as of states or actions that are not known to correspond to actuality.

Another example of the actual value of a diachronic study of modal syntax may be given. Reference to Latin will shed some light on the vexed question of the reason for the subjunctive after superlatives, the idea of first, etc. We recognize the type in *Omnium oratorum, quos quidem ego cognoverim, acutissimum* (Brut. 48. 180); *M. Antoni, omnium eloquentissimi quos ego audierim* (Tusc. 5. 19. 55).

Comparing a similar Romance sentence: *C'est le meilleur homme que je connaisse*, we notice that the antecedent present in the Latin sentences is lacking in Romance, for of course no one imagines that *homme* is the real antecedent of *que*. The supplying of such an antecedent in Romance, however, will not solve the difficulty, unless we have the certainty that this antecedent is indefinite. Referring to Latin, it appears that the subjunctive is seldom used in such expressions unless *quidem* accompanies the verb. Now *quidem* expresses the speaker's modesty; he evidently means to say: *of any whom I at least have known*. This may not explain satisfactorily every case of this type, but we have in the Latin and several Romance equivalents at least a perfectly logical expression of the kind, on the analogy of which possibly the subjunctive came to be used, first after any superlative, then after some adjectives of exclusive idea, then after limiting ordinals, and lastly after some other ordinals.

This explanation of the mood is purely grammatical. There remains the logical function of these limiting clauses to be considered. It appears that in such clauses the Fact is imagined as a standard of comparison by which the main statement (which is otherwise relative) may be measured. Closely allied to this latter class is the clause that forms the second member of a comparison.¹ In *Clarisse est belle et*

¹ Erich Müller, *Die Vergleichungsätze im Französischen*, Diss., Göttingen, 1900, pp. 113 ff.

sage autant que dans Paris il en soit de son âge (Corneille, *Le Menteur*, II, 5); and in *Il a la voix aussi forte qu'il l'aït jamais eue* (Boileau); we have clearly clauses serving thus as standards of comparison, as also in *Non dimandare più che utile ti sia; La stella talora altrimenti che sia la vera sua condizione* (Dante, *Conv.* III, x, 1). Possibly the relativity of the first statement may influence the choice of mood. There is certainly nothing unreal or uncertain in the content of the dependent clause. Fact is the standard by which the first statement is to be measured. But the content, although objectively true, is not definitely affirmed for its own sake, but rather represented mentally for the purpose of furnishing such a standard. In *dice che'l disciplinato chiede di sapere certezza ne le cose, secondo che ne la loro natura di certezza si riceva* (*Conv.* IV, xiii, 8), is seen a very similar function. Knowledge being relative the standard is fixed by the clause (cf. *autant que je sache, quod sciam*).

If from this review and discussion of theory any conclusions might be ventured, they would be stated as follows:

1. That there was probably never disagreement between language and thought when the subjunctive was first used in any given type of clause in the living language; yet, because modal choice may have been influenced by analogy, and also because certain expressions later became "petrified," the reason for the use of the mood in a given text may not be apparent, and may then be termed "mechanical." In this case the origin of the expression should be sought.
2. That logic alone often cannot arrive at the reason for modal choice. In this case, psychological analysis should be attempted, for it is the attitude of the speaker toward the content of the clause that has influenced his choice.
3. That the affective element (i.e., the subjective light in which the speaker regards the content of the clause) explains many, but not all uses of the subjunctive.
4. That "psychological subordination" is not a principle to which all cases of the subjunctive can be referred without oversubtle reasoning. Such subordination, moreover, is an abstraction that cannot explain modal choice in the living language, since it could not be readily perceived, much less understood, by the people. The vivacious peoples of the Romance territory, keenly perceptive of and responsive

to subtleties, would be far more likely to feel that certain expressions naturally required the representation of a state or action as purposively imaginative because denied, uncertain, unreal, or mentally considered, rather than affirmed. Again, the "psychological subject" is just as abstract as "psychological subordination," and is not easily discernible in all cases. Tendencies in organic speech are to be traced to real causes rather than to abstract principles; modality, therefore, explains modal choice more satisfactorily than does any *ex post facto* theory.

5. That the subjunctive mood in Romance in dependent clauses is possibly the instrument of connoting or reflecting, but not of expressing the modality of the context which is expressed by the context. Evidently the main purpose of the subjunctive in dependent clauses is purposive imaginative representation which frequently involves a more or less vivid mental projection into the future, and which accounts for the occasional substitution of the future or past future for the subjunctive. In independent clauses in Romance the subjunctive verb may express will, wish, ideal certainty, and (in one case) the potential nuance of intentional modesty; the expression of these modalities generally involves also a more or less vivid anticipatory power. Mental reserve is potential, i.e., of ancient optative origin. This mood connoted weak futurity, and such a force is sometimes apparent in clauses of unreal content. Where, however, these clauses represent the action as present or past, no such futurity, of course, is involved.

6. That all the uses of the subjunctive cannot be referred to any one modal principle such as unreality, uncertainty, volition, or even to two modal principles only, such as: volition (in the larger sense) and uncertainty, but that its only basic function is the subjective presentation of a state or action. Despite the fact that often in clauses of unreal content futurity is connoted by the verb, it will be useful for the purpose of classification to distinguish between the mood of volitive-optative origin with its connotation of futurity and the mood of imaginative representation of present, or past (and sometimes future) states or actions, whether corresponding to actuality or not.

The accompanying classification of all dependent clauses has been made on this basis.

PURPOSIVE IMAGINATIVE REPRESENTATION

- I. Of a *vivid future* state or action
 - A. After volitive expressions in
 - 1. Substantive clauses
 - 2. Descriptive clauses
 - 3. Clauses of plan or purpose
 - 4. Indirect questions
 - B. In anticipatory expressions that are
 - 1. Clauses of vividly anticipated states or actions
 - 2. Clauses of result vividly anticipated (also subjunctive clauses of anteriority, historical anticipation).
- II. Of a *less vivid future* state or action
 - C. After optative expressions (of request, wishing, trusting, hoping, consent, indifference, and after the impersonal expression of advisability, advantage, and necessity, if the *wish* of the speaker is expressed) in
 - 1. Substantive clauses
 - 2. Descriptive clauses
 - 3. Concessive clauses of indifference
 - 4. Imaginative comparisons (similes), the content of which is not plainly *contrary* to fact
 - 5. Relative clauses in similes
 - D. 1. In less vivid future conditions (including optative paratactic and hypotactic conditions not contrary to fact)
 - 2. In generalizing conditions
 - 3. In dependent clauses of proviso
 - E. After expressions of fear and caution in *quod*-clauses
 - F. After expressions of obligation and propriety (also present or past) in
 - 1. Substantive clauses
 - 2. Dependent clauses of reason
 - 3. Dependent questions (deliberation, perplexity)
 - 4. Descriptive clauses
 - G. After expressions of natural likelihood (also present or past) in
 - 1. Substantive clauses
 - 2. Dependent clauses
 - H. After expressions of possibility including those of belief that is not known to be mistaken (also present or past) in
 - 1. Substantive clauses
 - 2. Potential relative clauses
 - 3. Descriptive clauses after an incomplete descriptive word or indefinite expression, or a less vivid future condition
 - 4. Questions of fact

5. Clauses serving as a standard of comparison by which the main statement may be measured,
 - a) After superlatives: first, last, only, etc.
 - b) In the second member of a comparison: of inequality; of equality
- J. In less vividly anticipatory expressions (*cf.* I, B) that are
 1. Determinative clauses
 2. Descriptive clauses
 3. Clauses of state or action less vividly anticipated
 4. Clauses of result less vividly anticipated.
- III. Of *real* content occurring largely in formal reasoning; often as a means of offering a fact for judgment; but also associated with contingency
- K. In clauses that represent
 1. The fact as a logical conclusion
 2. The fact as a proposition to be proved or explained
 3. The fact in a statement or definition that is explanatory of a preceding more general expression
 4. The fact conceded, but recognized as not impairing the main contention
 5. The fact recognized as conflicting with the main affirmation
 6. The fact as a cause
 7. The fact that the speaker does not doubt, does not ignore, of which he is not unaware
 8. The fact considered as contingent
 9. The fact in the light of obligation propriety
 10. The fact as naturally likely
 11. The fact as having stirred feeling
 12. The fact as consecutive, and as such serving as a basis for conjecture
 13. The fact indirectly in a persuasive or conciliatory manner, at times imagining possible objections to it.
- IV. Of *unreal* content after expressions that involve mental reserve or negation in
 1. Descriptive clauses after a negative expression, questions implying a negative
 2. Clauses in which the imagined unreal state or action is consecutive
 3. Clauses of negative result
 4. Negative causal clauses (which may contain a rejected reason)
 5. Clauses in indirectness after an expression of belief that the speaker knows to be doubtful or mistaken
 6. Clauses in indirectness after positive expressions of doubt, negations, questions

7. Conditions contrary to fact
8. Optative paratactic conditions contrary to fact (past tense)
9. Imaginative comparisons plainly contrary to fact.

H. F. FIELD

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

THE ETYMOLOGY OF FRENCH *flanc*

A number of explanations of the origin of French *flanc* have been attempted but none has proved acceptable. A development proposed by Diez¹ (that it represents a nasalized form of Lat. *flaccus*) is very improbable, since there is no trace of an adjective **flancus* either in Latin or Romance. For, if we accept his semantic development that "flank" was "the soft part under the ribs," then we must presuppose an adj. form, **flancus* ("soft"), as parent-form. The only other explanation that has received any consideration has been the derivation from Ger. **hlanka*, OHG *lancha* ("Hüfte, Lende"), proposed over eighty years ago by Wackernagel,² which, though combated by Diez, seems, probably for want of a better explanation, to have been accepted by some etymologists.³ This derivation involves the unusual consonant shift *hl > fl*, for which only one Germanic word can be cited as evidence, viz., Ger. **hlupa-*, the first element forming compound proper names like *Hlupaving > Flovent*, *Hlupahari > Flovier*, *Hlupeward > Flodoard*, *Hlupheberht > Flobert*, etc.⁴ Advocates of this development, desiring other evidence than proper names, see in Fr. *flou* also a development from Ger. **hlāwa-*, NHG *lau*, etc.⁵ This seems far-fetched, however, in view of the fact that Fr. *flou* can easily be explained from forms in *fl-*, Baist, for example, explaining it as a derivative of Lat. *flavus*.⁶ But even disregarding this very questionable phonetic change, the most telling objection to this source was raised by Diez when he pointed out that OHG *hlanca* is feminine and would have given Fr. *flanke* f. and not *flanc* m., for almost without exception Germanic feminines in *a* retain their gender with feminine *e* in Romance.

¹ *Etym. Wb.*, I, 137, s.v. "flanco."

² *ZfdA*, II, 556.

³ Kluge, *Etym. Wb.*, apparently accepts it without question, so also Falk-Torp. *Etym. Wb.* Weigand, *DWb.*, is doubtful, and the French dictionaries, for the most part, reject it, declaring the origin unknown.

⁴ Cf. Mackel, "Die germanischen Elemente in der französischen und provenzalischen Sprache," *Französische Studien*, VI, 135.

⁵ Cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Gram. des Langues Rom.*, I, 37, and Gröber, *Grundriss*, I, 508.

⁶ Kluge, *op. cit.*, s.v. "flau." For a Ger. base **flāwa-* synonymous with **hlāwa-* see Falk-Torp, *ibid.*, s.v. "flau."

That Fr. *flanc* is a loan-word there can scarcely be any doubt, but how early it appeared is difficult to say. It must have been in current use in the latter part of the eleventh century. The earliest recorded occurrence, so far as I have been able to discover, is in the *Chanson de Roland*,¹ but it is recorded almost simultaneously in the *Prudentius Glosses* in the British Museum which Napier² puts around 1100 A.D. Here is written *flances*, translated by "ilia." The earliest meaning of the word, therefore—and this all the quotations from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries corroborate—was "the fleshy part of the side of man or animal between the ribs and hip." That the word was in common usage in the Old French period is attested by the large number of derivatives from the stem, such as *flanche*, *flanchel*, *flanchet*, *flanchiere*, *flancor*, *flanquade*, *flanquier*, etc.,³ some of which appear for the first time, however, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The development of meaning is also fairly clear. From the idea, "the muscular part of the body between ribs and hips," naturally came such meanings as "side, belly, womb, bosom, etc." From "side" developed "the side of anything," such as "house, hill, fortification, etc." In the sixteenth century the word was specialized as a military term meaning "side of the army," and then developed the verbal idea *flanquer* referring to movements of bodies of troops. These military terms were then borrowed by other European countries, in the latter part of the century by the Dutch, and in the seventeenth century by the Germans who spelled the word at first after the form of the verb, viz., *flanque*, later changing the *qu* to *k*. In England the word was borrowed much earlier, being quoted in the original meaning as early as the fourteenth century in the form *flanke*.

But to return to the question of the origin of the word. In the writer's opinion the word is not a derivative from the Ger. **hlanka* but from a Ger. **flank-*, a stem found in all the important High German dialects. Compare the following: Bav. *flank* m., "Funke; f. herumziehende, liederliche Weibsperson," *flanken*, *flänkeln*, *flankieren*, "sich hangend bewegen, die Flügel, die Arme schwingen, sb. Stück,

¹ "Graisles es flancs et larges les costez," l. 3158; "Les dous costez li desclvret des flancs," l. 3467.

² *Acad.*, XLV, 457.

³ Cf. Godefroy, *Dict.*

mit dem Nebengriff des Niederhangens und Schwankens; Fetzen," *flänkel*, "Flügel"; Swab. *flanke* plu., "grosse Schneeflocken," *flankieren*, "nach allen Richtungen sich hin u. her bewegen"; Als. *flankieren*, *id.*; Carinth. *flanke*, *flankl*, "ein in der Luft wehendes Stück Tuch," *flankn*, "flattern, herumschweifen." Ablaut forms in *flink*- and *flunk*- as in MHG *kupfervlinke*, "flimmerndes Kupferschüppchen," NHG *flinken*, *flinkern*, "flimmen, glänzen," *flink* adj., "munter u. mit Leichtigkeit geschwind," *flunkern*, "Zitterschein von sich geben, schimmern," Bav. *flunken*, "Funke," etc., are common to both High and Low German dialects.¹

Related forms with Ger. **flang*- we have in Swiss *flanggen*, "Stück, z.B. Fleisch; Fetzen, Lappen; Flügel, Zipfel des Kleides," *flanggieren*, "schwingen, z.B. mit einer Rute hin u. her fahren," etc. Belonging to the same base are MHG *vlanc* (*ges*), "Funke" (cf. the Bavarian form above), OSwed. *flenga*, "strike," Swed. *flänga*, "hin u. her rennen," ME *flingen*, "hurl," NE *fling*, etc.

An OHG *flank* borrowed by the French would have become OFr. *flanc*, as may be seen by comparing other borrowed forms, e.g., Bav. *flinke* f. is Fr. *flinque*.² Phonetically, therefore, there can be no objection to the foregoing derivation.

The primary meaning of the foregoing group of Germanic words was "move quickly back and forth," and from this primary meaning also develop the meanings of OFr. *flanc*. The OHG word, the parent-form of OFr. *flanc*, meant primarily "that [part of the body] which moves to and fro [in breathing]." Names of parts of the body as well as other object names were primarily descriptive terms, and since that part of the body, especially in animals such as the horse, cow, dog, etc., after violent exertion showed a particularly noticeable heaving, and even in repose gave evidence of constant movement to and fro in breathing, this characteristic caused a term to be applied to it from the verbal idea. Thus *flank*, "that which moves to and fro," would be just as naturally derived from *flanken*, "move to and fro," as, for example, OHG *sweif*, "that [part of the body] which swings, i.e.,

¹ These words may be regarded as nasalized forms of Ger. **flib*-, **flak*- stems, in OE *flacor*, "flying," *flacerian*, "flutter"; MHG *slackern*, "flackern," etc., with a primary meaning, "make a quick movement, move back and forth." Cf. Wood, *Color Names*, I, 19.

² Cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Rom. Etym. Wb.*, s.v. "flinque."

the tail," is derived from OHG *sweifan*, "swing," and innumerable similar cases. That there was such a form as *flanken*, even though not recorded in the older dialects, is very likely, judging from its wide occurrence in the High German dialects and the large number of derivatives from this stem. Being most likely a dialect word, it naturally would not be found in the records of the literary language.

That the semantic development indicated here is not only possible but probable will be clear from an examination of the development of meaning of designations for such parts of the body as are mobile. For example, the head is named as "that which nods" in OE *hnifol*, "forehead," *hnipian*, "bow the head"; ON *hnipa*, "hang the head"; MHG *nipfen*, "gleiten, stürzen, einnicken";¹ or "that which sways and bobs to and fro" in Sax. *gimms*, "Kopf"; Swiss *gimslen*, "sich hin und her bewegen"; or E dial. *niddick*, "head, skull"; ME *nodile*, "head"; NE *nod*, "incline the head with a quick motion"; E dial. *noddle*, "make light and frequent nods." More significant still are names for "belly," almost synonymous with our word in its earlier meaning, in Swab. *hudel*, "Lumpen, Bauch"; Swiss *hudlen*, "schlottern, bammeln"; or Swiss *nötter*, "grosser, dicker Wanst"; Swab. *nottlen*, "etwas hin und her bewegen, wackeln."²

That the flank was thought of as something moving to and fro is further shown by the French idiom *se battre les flancs*, "faire des efforts inutiles," and NHG *flankenschlagen*, "gewaltsame Bewegung in den Seiten eines Tieres, gewöhnlich Vorbote seines Todes."³

SAMUEL KROESCH

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

¹ Wood, *IF*, XVIII, 30.

² For many other examples see Arnoldson, *Parts of the Body in Older Germanic and Scandinavian*, Chicago, 1915, and Baskett, *Parts of the Body in the Later Germanic Dialects*, Chicago, 1920.

³ Grimm, *DWB*, s.v. "*flankenschlagen*."

NOTES AND COMMENTS

A noteworthy conference is that called to meet in Paris, December 18 and 19 of this year, under the joint auspices of the Société des anciens Textes français, founded in 1875, and the editor of the journal *Romania*, which was founded in 1872. Both organizations have functioned for fifty years, and it is now proposed, in a convocation of the friends and subscribers of both, to re-examine the field of their activities and lay detailed plans for the future. Among the subjects to be considered are: a general list of texts, Old French and possibly also medieval Latin, whose publication is desirable; revision of the practical rules for text-editing which were drawn up by Paul Meyer, in 1909; a project for an Old French dictionary, utilizing the materials already assembled by Godefroy, Tobler, and others; a project for a dictionary of proper names; organization of a regular service for the multiplication of manuscript materials; establishment of a bibliography of Romance philology and particularly of medieval literary history. All students and scholars who are interested in any of these practical matters are invited to attend the conference, or, if that is impracticable, to convey their ideas in writing at once to the secretary, M. Edmond Faral, 7, rue du Centre, à la Varenne-Saint-Hilaire (Seine).—T. A. J.

From its beginning *The Review of English Studies*, under the editorship of Dr. R. B. McKerrow with the co-operation of a score of able scholars, gave promise of being an excellent journal. It has lived up to expectations and, as its first year draws to a close, already occupies an outstanding position in the field of English scholarship. The contributions, covering many fields and periods, include reviews, bibliographies, collections of notes on literary history, philological and bibliographical studies, critical articles, such sound discussions of problems as Chambers' "Integrity of *The Tempest*," significant constructive studies like Greg's "Evidence of Theatrical Plots for the History of the Elizabethan Stage," and investigations involving important discoveries like Ward's "Authorship of the *Arte of English Poesie*." Indeed, a number of articles have been significant contributions to English literary history, and the inevitable quota of mediocre work has been small. It is to be hoped that the journal will receive the recognition which it deserves and that English and American scholars will subscribe to it in such numbers as to assure its continuance.—C. R. B.

To the series of French histories of literature which includes M. Lanson's *Histoire de la littérature française* has just been added a noteworthy *Histoire de la littérature anglaise* by the two distinguished masters of English studies

at the Sorbonne, MM. Émile Legouis and Louis Cazamian.¹ It is impossible in the few lines at our disposal to do justice to the merits of constructive thinking, literary tact, and fresh scholarship which make this new history, all things considered, probably the most intelligent and suggestive general survey of English literature which has yet been written. The two collaborators have brought, of course, quite different qualities to their task—M. Legouis a fine clarity and exquisite sense of art, M. Cazamian a no less unusual grasp of psychological and philosophical values and a power of synthesis which, though it sometimes results in formulas that are a bit abstract and overschematic, yet never fails to stimulate. In spite of these temperamental divergences, a real unity of purpose and attitude animates the work as a whole. Unlike most of the single-volume histories of English literature published hitherto, it is not a mere manual of facts. Conceived in the spirit and after the model of M. Lanson's *Histoire*, its extremely compact and substantial pages are addressed to mature students who may be supposed already familiar with the principal facts and texts. For such students it aims to furnish, along with the more essential biographical and bibliographical data, an ordered interpretation of the development of literature in England in which the main divisions are made to rest—and here the superiority of the work to the chaotic *Cambridge History* is strikingly evident—not upon irrelevant political or biographical events, but upon fundamental changes in the character and direction of literary feeling. Written thus "from the inside," stressing the various impulses, psychological, philosophical, social as well as artistic, which led writers to create in the forms they did, subordinating consistently the lives of authors and the development of genres to the general movement of taste, it is hardly an exaggeration to say that it is the first comprehensive survey of English literature that deserves to be called a "synthetic history" in the true sense of that term. Some of its generalizations, especially in the second part (1660–1914), are fresh and illuminating to a degree. The pages, for example, in which M. Cazamian sketches the alteration in the tone of English letters at the end of the seventeenth century (VI, vii), those in which he marks the relations of Defoe and the periodical essayists to the ascent of the commercial middle class (VII, iv), his treatment of the revolutionary literature of the last decade of the eighteenth century (IX, vi), the distinction which he draws between the two generations of romantic poets (X, i, iv), his definition of the changes which took place in the late Victorian period (XII, i), his courageous attempt to bring order into the chaos of post-war literature (XII, v)—it would be an unusual reader who could not find in these sections matter for fruitful reflection, reflection all the more fruitful, perhaps, for occasionally issuing in disagreement.

We would not leave the impression, however, that the distinguishing merits of the new history are to be found exclusively in its qualities of organization. Along with a typically French concern for clearness of general outline,

¹ Pp. xiii + 1312. Paris: Hachette, 1924.

its writers exhibit a rare sense of the unique traits, the individualizing complexities of authors, and within the firm but flexible framework of historical movement which constitutes the backbone of the work they have given us a series of portraits many of which are masterpieces of compression and of psychological and literary penetration. As examples of particularly suggestive characterizations we may refer to the pages of M. Legouis on Spenser, Burton, Marvell, and Cowley; and to those of M. Cazamian on the Butler of *Hudibras*, Thomson, Crabbe, Hazlitt, and Thackeray. The scholarship of the book, too, is of a high order. Both writers, it is evident throughout, speak from a prolonged first-hand acquaintance with the original texts. There is abundant evidence also, both in the bibliographies—especially in Part II; those in Part I are many of them in need of being brought up to date—and in the text, that they have written in constant awareness of the more significant results of recent scholarship, American as well as French, German, and British. In short, though specialists will no doubt have their reservations about this or that detail or interpretation, and though MM. Legouis and Cazamian will no doubt find many things to alter in a second edition (we hope they will be guided by M. Lanson's example in the matter of alterations as they have been in other features of the work), the book as it stands does high honor both to them and to French scholarship, and it will long prove a helpful and stimulating guide, not only to the younger French "anglicisants" for whom it was written, but also to their many fellow-students throughout the world.—R. S. C.

The literature of monographs dealing with early eighteenth-century English writers has been enriched, within the last few months, by two important French publications.

In his *Daniel De Foe et ses romans*¹ M. Paul Dottin has given us a detailed study of *Crusoe* and the "secondary novels," preceded by a substantial and in many ways a fresh interpretation of Defoe's life, and followed by a list of his writings. The execution of the work bears some signs of haste. There is frequently a regrettable lack of precision in the references; the organization of the second part (on *Crusoe*) is less compact than M. Dottin was capable of making it; the exposition is sometimes unnecessarily diffuse. It is possible to take exception, also, to certain features of the method. Thus, while there can be little doubt that Defoe's writings are full of passages that reflect his early experiences in London and on the Continent, it may be questioned whether M. Dottin is warranted in drawing from them all the inferences that appear in chapters i and ii of his first part. On the other hand, the merits of the work as a contribution both to our knowledge of Defoe's life and psychology and to our understanding of his novels are far from negligible. Thanks to a painstaking exploration of contemporary newspapers and of hitherto unknown or unexploited manuscript materials at the British Museum

¹ Pp. x+806. Paris: Presses Universitaires, 1924.

and the Record Office, M. Dottin has been able to throw new light on a number of obscure points in Defoe's career—on the date of his birth (pp. 10-11), on his family (*ibid.*), on his father-in-law (p. 48), on the date and circumstances of his change of name (p. 74), on his rôle as a political spy under William (pp. 93-94), on his arrest and imprisonment in 1703 (pp. 106 ff.), on the details of his journeys to Scotland (chaps. ix, x, xi), on his second arrest in 1713 (pp. 215-23), on his relations with Mist (pp. 236-39, 253-56). A similar freshness characterizes much of his treatment of the novels in Parts II and III. For the first time we have something like an adequate history of the fortune and influence of *Crusoe* in Europe. For the first time, too, we have a really serious study of the "secondary novels" in their relation both to one another and to the earlier and contemporary popular production out of which they sprang; M. Dottin's most valuable contribution, indeed, is probably to be found in the two hundred and fifty pages which he devotes to these hitherto unduly neglected narratives. If his biographical method occasionally sins on the side of imprudence, he abundantly atones for his earlier lack of caution by the good sense with which he handles many of the problems raised by the novels. There is a sanity, for example, about his discussion of the "sources" of the first part of *Crusoe* that comes as a refreshing contrast to a great deal that has been printed recently concerning Defoe's masterpiece.

The other work—*Swift: les années de jeunesse et le "Conte du Tonneau,"* by M. Émile Pons¹—is the first part of a comprehensive study of Swift and his writings projected before the war. The portion now published comprises two books—the one, a critical survey of the literature on Swift; the other, an account of Swift's career to about 1701, culminating in an elaborate examination of the two great early satires, the *Battle of the Books* and the *Tale of a Tub*. M. Pons displays considerable acuteness in his handling of the enormously difficult problems of Swift's personality and conduct in this formative period of his life. In the nature of things he has not been able to add much in the way of new fact, though he has made good use, for the first time in an extended biography, of a number of letters and other documents which have come to light only in recent years. The distinctive and valuable features of his book are his analysis of the growth of Swift's satirical temper between 1689 and 1696, his reconstruction of Swift's reading at Moor Park, and his study of the genesis and meaning of the *Tale of a Tub*. The last is a contribution of the first importance, a model of psychological and philosophical insight. More clearly and fully than any of his predecessors M. Pons brings out the rôle which myth, and especially what he calls the "mythe animal," played in Swift's satiric imagination; he shows in a most illuminating way how the other myths of the *Tale*—that of the clothes-worshippers and that of the Æolists—are related to this fundamental myth; and he throws into sharp relief the religious attitude which underlies the allegory of the three brothers. His analysis is suggestive in the extreme. If he falls short in any particular

¹ Pp. xii + 410. Strasbourg: Comité des Publications de la Faculté des lettres, 1925.

of what we might legitimately expect of him, it is in his too great neglect of purely historical considerations. Swift emerges from his pages too isolated, too much cut off from the stream of seventeenth-century thought. A few interesting paragraphs on the intellectual atmosphere of Trinity College in the eighties (pp. 124-29); some suggestive remarks on the importance of Montaigne, La Rochefoucauld, and Hobbes in Swift's culture (pp. 217-18); an important discussion of the analogies between Erasmus and the "Digression on Madness" (pp. 385-87)—the effort which M. Pons makes to "situate" the Swift of the early satires in his century goes very little beyond these few uncoordinated developments. That much more might have been done will be evident to anyone who has read R. F. Jones's monograph on the "Background of the *Battle of the Books*" ("University of Washington Studies," 1920)—M. Pons seems not to know this excellent study—or who has examined the analysis of seventeenth-century "anti-rationalism" contained in F. B. Kaye's recent edition of Mandeville's *Fable of the Bees*. M. Pons, however, is to be congratulated on having written the most interesting book on Swift's early work that has yet been published. We shall be impatient until we learn what he has to tell us about *Gulliver*.—R. S. C.

Students of medieval literature will welcome Professor Warnke's third edition of the *Lais* of Marie de France (Halle, 1925). With the help of Georg Cohn, the editor has once more revised the text; and it is significant that he now designates the language of Marie as "Old Francian" or "Norman," in accordance with the hypothesis of Gertrud Wacker (see now A. Långfors in *Romania*, LI, 295 ff.). Introduction and notes have also been brought up to date, and an appendix gives the text of the *Lay of Guingamor* (edited by P. Kusel), which many scholars have long since assigned to Marie. Of especial interest are the sound arguments brought against the rather ingenious theories of Ezio Levi: Warnke continues to date the *Lais* as prior to the *Ille et Galeron* by Gautier d'Arras (1167-68); but his argument would have been strengthened had he consulted F. A. G. Cowper's article in *Modern Philology* (XX, 1922). Moreover, some reference should have been given to T. P. Cross's valuable studies on the Celtic sources of Marie: *Revue Celtique* (XXXI [1910], 413 ff.); *Kittredge Anniversary Papers* ([1913], pp. 377-87), and *Modern Philology* (XII [1915], 585-644) (an important study on the Lanval and Graelent theme). This would have been more useful than giving space to a refutation of Winkler's ill-starred attempt to identify Marie with her namesake, the Countess of Champagne.

Another noteworthy work now in its third edition is Voretzsch's *Einführung in das Studium der Altfranzösischen Literatur* (Halle, 1925). The author's own *Lesebuch* (published separately) is to be followed by a *Lesebuch des späteren Mittelalters*, the editor of which is Kurt Glaser (Marburg). Besides notable bibliographical additions (it is remarkable that despite the blight of the war-period so few important titles are missing), Voretzsch has revised his

material in such a way as to show more clearly its historical development. This has affected chiefly the treatment of Ovid, the *lais*, and the courtly romance. In most respects, the improvement has been considerable. The more is it to be regretted that we should still find such statements as "[*Tristan*] von haus aus keltisch, wie besonders G. Paris, J. Loth and Thurneysen gezeigt haben" (p. 280). The fact is that Gertrude Schoepperle was the first to point out the real Celtic analogues of the Tristan story, and that Thurneysen's article is mainly a corroboration of her discoveries. Again, no reference is made to Cross's studies on the *lais* (see above), and the general bibliography (pp. 518 ff.) should have mentioned Ch.-V. Langlois' *La Connaissance de la nature et du monde au moyen âge* (1911) and J. W. Wells's *Manual of the Writings in Middle English* (1916), a work in which so much of the material is French.—W. A. N.

With the recent appearance of the eighth fascicle of the Tobler-Lommatzsch *Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch*, the end of the first volume (including the letters A-B) has been reached, after regrettable delays. Adolf Tobler announced his project of an Old French dictionary as long ago as 1872; in 1880, Godefroy began the publication of his monumental but uncritical *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne Langue française*, and Tobler postponed his own undertaking, although his plan differed in some respects from that of Godefroy: Tobler was to confine himself to printed texts, omitting manuscript sources and legal documents. In March, 1915, the publishers (Weidmann, Berlin) announced that the materials assembled by Tobler during his long lifetime (he had died in 1910) had been made ready for publication by Erhard Lommatzsch and would appear in some twenty-five fascicles, thanks to a subvention of the Prussian Academy of Sciences. There is no doubt but that this work will immediately assume a place of importance for all scholars who interest themselves in medieval French language and literature; indeed, it is probable that those who subscribe to the dictionary at this stage will save themselves considerable expense. The present work not only has the benefit of Godefroy's extensive collections, but utilizes also the immense critical labor embodied in Meyer-Lübke's *Romanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (1911-20) and in scores of special shorter treatises. It therefore marks a great stride forward in the field of French lexicography. There is every reason to hope that the complete work may now appear without further delay.—T. A. J.

The last dissertation to be written under the direction of the late Professor H. A. Todd is probably that of Dorothy Turville, of London, Ontario, entitled *French Feminine Singular Nouns derived from Latin Neuter Plurals*.¹ Miss Turville has divided her treatment into six divisions: "Names of

¹ Printed by Carranza and Company, New York, forming an attractive volume of 236 pages. It is unfortunate that the book is not for sale; it can be obtained only as an exchange thesis from Columbia University.

Fruits," "Doublets," "Forms of the Dual Number," "Nouns in *-aille*," "Nouns in *-aie*," "Miscellaneous Nouns." There is also a bibliography, list of texts quoted, an Appendix containing in chronological order quotations from those who have previously discussed the problem, and an index of the two hundred and thirty-three words which form the basis of the discussion. The work has been carefully done, the examples are plentiful, and an accurate account has been taken of theories previously presented, such as Meyer-Lübke's discussion of *feuille* and Oliver M. Johnston's remarks apropos of *pomme*. It is to be regretted that there is no attempt to interpret the evidence; there are no general conclusions of a psychological nature. This was to be expected when Miss Turville confined herself to Old French with practically no reference to Italian, but the problem really goes much farther even than the Romance field. For a thorough understanding it must be studied in relation with similar psychological processes in other languages, the use of the singular verb with neuter plurals in Greek, the occurrence of feminine singular adjectives with the broken plurals in Arabic, and so on. It is ultimately a subject for the general philologist, and Miss Turville, of course, did not aim as high as that.—URBAN T. HOLMES.

Among the best contributions to the fourth centenary of Ronsard¹ is *Ronsard et son temps*, by Pierre Champion, brother of the well-known publisher. As the title indicates, the book is a biography of the poet, rich in detail and written in a graceful and *déagagé* manner, a veritable "illustration" of the humanist of the sixteenth century. What it lacks is any thoroughgoing, critical appraisal of Ronsard's art: the doctrine for which he stood and the various periods of his artistic evolution. On the other hand, the author sketches in the background more fully than any of his predecessors (see Longnon and Jusserand). Especially noteworthy is the chapter on "The Court of Henry III," and the belated justice done to that interesting monarch. From these pages the reader will get a vivid impression, not only of Ronsard, but also of Daurat, Cassandre, Marie, Hélène, and Michel de l'Hospital. The value of the book for scholars is increased by its excellent Index (pp. 485-502). The notes, at the foot of the page, give ample bibliographical references, at times of an original character, and the beauty of the volume is enhanced by twenty-four fascinating *planches*.

A rather trying task, admirably executed, is the doctoral thesis (?) *Les épitaphes de Ronsard* (Presses universitaires, 1925), by Margaret de Schweinitz. This study is not only exhaustive as regards Ronsard, but it also gives interesting suggestions on the rise of the French epitaph as a genre.—W. A. N.

The celebration in May, 1925, of the eleventh centenary of the foundation of the University of Pavia was the occasion of a publication, by L. C.

¹ See R. C. Williams, *Mod. Lang. Journal*, IX, 489.

Bollea, "Gli Studenti ultramontani all' Università di Pavia," in *Universitatis Ticinensis Saecularia undecima die XXI maii an. MCMXXV* (Pavia, 1925). A second article by the same author, on British professors and students at the University of Pavia in the fifteenth century, has been furnished us in translation by Professor K. McKenzie and is reproduced herewith:

A recent investigation of the attendance of foreigners at the University of Pavia in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, when French and German visitors were especially numerous, has brought to my attention the names of several British professors and students. This recalled to my mind what Lewis Einstein wrote in regard to Anglo-Italian relations in the fifteenth century: "The influence of Italy on English learning during the Renaissance differed in several respects from that exercised by the other European nations. It was first in the field, and for that reason long single in its power. Its individual influence, moreover, proved the greatest factor in modifying existing intellectual conditions, while it supplemented the entire mediaeval fabric of learning by the new system it had itself originated."¹

Considering the importance of this influence on English culture, and the fact that "the field can be narrowed still further by remembering that during the fifteenth century in England, learning was almost entirely confined to the universities,"² it seems to me worth while to call the attention of English-speaking scholars to the presence of these British students and professors at Pavia in the fifteenth century.

Einstein studies admirably the influence of the humanistic movement in England; but he limits his study to Duke Humphrey of Gloucester, son of Henry IV—the great patron of this new intellectual movement and the friend of Pier Candido Decembrio, of Leonardo Bruni, of Guarino Veronese—and to a few humanists like Thomas Beckinton, Bishop of Wells and a Doctor of Laws of Oxford, Thomas Chandler, William Grey, Nicholas Bildstone, Archdeacon of Winchester, Richard Pettworth, Richard de Bury, Osbern Bowkenham, Reynold Chicheley, Andrew Ols, John Free, Robert Flemming, Gunthorpe, and John Tiptoft.

If, however, around these greater humanistic luminaries we also allow the lesser ones to shine with their modest light, the cultural firmament of England will become much more luminous. The Germans have understood this fact in their own case, and have devoted patient research to the reconstruction of the whole goliardic movement from Germany to Italy; in this they have attained remarkable results, the most important being the publication by Friedländer and Malagola of the roll of German students at Bologna, and the investigation of these students by Knod. The French, likewise, have appreciated the importance of the migration of their students to Italy during the humanistic period; a few years ago, Picot published two studies concerning the French professors and students at the universities of Pavia and Padua.

So far as I am aware, the only similar studies concerning Englishmen are those of Andrich,³ dealing with Padua; but similar studies should be made for

¹ L. Einstein, *The Italian Renaissance in England*, p. 1. New York: Columbia University Press, 1902.

² *Ibid.*, p. 2.

³ J. A. Andrich, *De natione Anglica et Scota Juristarum Universitatis Patavinae, Padua, 1892; Rotulus et matricula DD. Juristarum et Artistarum Gymnasii Patavini a MDXCII* (in collaboration with Brugi), Padua, 1892.

Ferrara, Bologna, Turin, Pavia, Rome, Florence, all of which were important university centers in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. To aid in such studies, many individual investigators will have to prepare the way; in every university city in Italy, some investigator should point out to English-speaking scholars the names of Englishmen who came to Italy to study; and then someone in England could proceed to study the career of each one of these migrating students. This last should be a relatively easy task, considering that "intellectual activity centred almost exclusively around Oxford," so that sufficient biographical information concerning these Englishmen who went to Italy to study could doubtless be found there.

The few names that I can offer of Englishmen who studied at Pavia—the Dominican John Palz, who studied theology there; Arnaldo and William of Sceyfordia, who studied canon law; Thomas Kent of England, rector of the Collegio Castiglioni at Pavia, professor of canon law and lecturer for the ultramontane students on civil law—confirm Einstein's statement that "excepting Tiptoft, Earl of Worcester, they were churchmen."

This Thomas Kent of England can be identified, I believe, with the man of the same name of whom Einstein, following Leonardo Bruni, speaks: "Much later, Leonardo Bruno said of Thomas of England, an Augustinian monk who went to Florence to purchase manuscripts, and lectured there in 1395, that he keenly loved the new Italian humanism, as much as one of his nation was able to understand it."¹

These students and teachers of canon law and theology, as well as John Keyf, a student of the Collegio Castiglioni, and Thomas Stranger of London, who received his degree in medicine at Pavia,² belong to the period of which Einstein says: "About the middle of the fifteenth century, the chief progress in English humanism came through the journeys of university students to Italy"; it is doubtless true that "in all likelihood they were unaware of the significance of the movement they had started afresh. It probably seemed to them only a continuation of the mediaeval migrations which in former days united the learned world, before the feeling of the intellectual kinship of Europe had disappeared amid the struggles of rival nations," but nevertheless they were unconsciously bringing the influence of humanism to bear in England. "During the Middle Ages, English scholars were by no means unknown in Italy," and "at the University of Bologna there was an English 'nation,' and both Vicenza and Vercelli had English rectors, while on the registers of Padua, British names appear frequently";³ but Englishmen were no less known at the University of Pavia, as the names mentioned above indicate. Coming beyond the period of humanism, Pardi⁴ mentions an Englishman named Gabriel Gistiano of Ivons, who after having studied at Toulouse, Paris, and Bologna, passed several years at the University of Pavia, and finally received his doctorate in Ferrara, July 30, 1550.—L. C. BOLLEA.

Bruno Borowski's monograph, *Lautdubletten im Altenglischen*,⁵ treats a more extensive field than the word "doublets" in its title suggests; it is, in

¹ Einstein, *op. cit.*, pp. 2, 15, 18.

² R. Malocchì, *Codice diplomatico dell' Università di Pavia (1400-1450)*, II, Pavia, 1915.

³ Einstein, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

⁴ G. Pardi, *Titoli dottorali conferiti dallo Studio di Ferrara nei secoli XV e XVI*, Lucca, 1900.

⁵ Pp. vii + 84. Halle: Niemeyer, 1924.

fact, a study of old English words for which two or more forms seem to have existed, e.g., *Uhtred*, *Uhterd*; *Æfelwulf*, *Æfewulf*; *-fæst*, *-fest*. As these variations are often found in syllables which do not bear principal stress, they involve many difficult problems of sound-change. To their solution the author brings a comprehensive and exact knowledge of the methods and results of modern linguistic study, and he is usually able to give a reasonable explanation of most of the cases. As the volume is provided with an index of the words studied, it is useful as a supplement to the reference books on old English grammar.—J. R. H.

The fourth edition (Halle, 1923) of Adolf Noreen's *Altisländische und Altnorwegische Grammatik* is such a book as only Noreen, with his long years of training, could have given us. The xvi+466 pages, giving succinctly the results of modern research to date, furnish a grammar that will long be the standard and can never be entirely superseded. Nothing but praise should be accorded the book, yet from the viewpoint of Germanic and Indo-European linguistics an objection might be raised here and there against some of the explanations given. In § 292, *fjórir*, "four," may better be referred to Germ. **fegwōriz*: OE *fēower*, OHG *fīon*, rather than to Goth. *fīdur*-, *fīdwōr*. The WGerm. form would represent pre-Germ. **peqwōres*, with *-q-* abstracted from the IE word for "five." Too little attention is given to *w*-gemination (§ 279, 2). Here should have been added such examples as *qþrom megom* (§ 278) and many of the words found in § 318. Apparently my article on "Germanic *w*-Gemination" did not come into Noreen's hands. Some of the comparisons made in § 318 are hardly allowable, certainly not *knōpa*, "knead": *knútr*, "knot." The first word has a developed *u*, the second an original *ū*. By the same token I should put *sofa*, "sleep," and *vefa*, "weave," in the fifth, not the fourth series, in spite of the *o* in the pret. part. For this *o* is original IE *u*: **suponós*, **ubhonós*, and therefore not the same as in *borenn*, *stolenn*, etc. But aside from a few unimportant items like these the book is all that could be desired, and, in any case, indispensable.—F. A. W.

The fascicles of Docent Olof Östergren's *Nusvensk ordbok* appear with the greatest punctuality. The last fascicle, Number 24, gets as far as *glas* and nearly completes the second volume. From the scale on which the work is being done it will require about seven volumes. Not until then will Sweden possess a satisfactory dictionary, for the dictionary of the Swedish Academy is planned on such a huge scale that it will take another century to complete. The Östergren dictionary is unique among modern works of its scope in that it is to the last details the work of one man, and also in that, while a model of philological accuracy, it is, by its choice of illustrative citations and its crisp and fitting language, a work in which a rich personality has found expression.—C. N. G.

¹ *Mod. Phil.*, XVIII, 79 ff., 303 ff.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

La Peinture des mœurs de la bonne société dans le roman français de 1715 à 1761. By FREDERICK CHARLES GREEN. Pp. 259. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1924.

Brunetière remarked in his book on Balzac that French novelists owe to the influence of Walter Scott a realization of the importance of "*tous ces détails que nous tenons pour expressifs de la vie et qui le sont, le mobilier, le costume, les usages de la vie journalière, la manière de manger ou de se divertir.*" This Mr. Green considers tantamount to the assertion that the *roman de mœurs* appears in France only in the nineteenth century. One infers that he will undertake to prove the incorrectness of such a view. If such was his intention, he seems fortunately to have lost sight of it, for it would have led chiefly into an unprofitable discussion of terms. Brunetière does not himself hesitate to name both Lesage and Marivaux in connection with the *roman de mœurs*, which proves that he had no intention of being exclusive when he granted to Scott a certain influence in the development of the Balzacian technique. One must not overlook the fact that to authors prior to 1830 material details had little importance in themselves. When not vague, they usually have a satiric value in connection with a type of which the writer is making sport. But the house, the clothes, and the pocket-knife of Grandet have a value of their own; they complete the physical and the moral picture of the central personage and carry no additional ironic implication.

Except for Marivaux, none of the better-known eighteenth-century novelists appear in Mr. Green's study. The author limits himself to the *roman de mœurs*, in which is painted the manners of polite society, "*ou, si l'on veut, de la bonne société.*" The genre he defines thus: "*un roman qui consacre une grande partie de ses pages à des tableaux de la manière de vivre, d'agir et de penser qui est particulière à certaines catégories de la société*" (p. 2). He excludes *Gil Blas* because of the dominant satiric element and the universal character of the personages. Yet, so far as one may judge from the excerpts given in the text—for the reviewer has access to very few of the books mentioned—the prevailing tone in the works from which he draws is satiric. Prévost, too, is left out, as are Mme de Tencin, Crébillon fils, and Mme Riccoboni. Only three or four of the thirty-nine novels used as sources are listed in Lanson's *Manuel bibliographique*, and none, except those of Marivaux, appear in Lebreton's *Roman au XVIII^e siècle*. Mr. Green has sought his material in little-known or forgotten authors, some of whom, like the Marquis d'Argens and La Morlière, are better known through their connection with the *mouvement philosophique*

than as novel writers. Here, then, one may test the theory that lesser authors provide the best sources for the study of contemporary tendencies.

The study consists of two main parts. In the first and longer of these, entitled *Tableau des mœurs dans le roman*, the author examines in considerable detail the contents of thirty-nine of the three hundred and more novels that were published within the period, selecting therefrom the elements that illustrate upper-class life: the nobility, the upper middle class, the church, the stage, the army, and high finance. The second main division is devoted to a "vérification du tableau des mœurs" from other sources: memoirs, diaries, critical and controversial writings of the period, as well as recent scientific studies of eighteenth-century society. The arrangement, though logical, is not a happy one for the reader, who would enter with more zest into a critical study of the evidence if this followed immediately after the summary of the novelists' contributions to the history of manners.¹

In the Introduction (pp. 2-30) the author examines the eighteenth-century view of the novel. The genre is still held to be of minor value. Verisimilitude is demanded. Critics like La Bataille, the Abbé de la Porte, and Delasolle insist that men shall be presented as they are rather than as they ought to be, as had been the practice of older authors. However, scenes from common life are not admitted, and critics justify the existence of novels only in so far as they are useful. That is, eighteenth-century critics seem to accept the view commonly held by seventeenth-century novelists, almost the only ones in their time to ascribe to the genre any other merit than that of being entertaining. The concessions made by a number of critics of the eighteenth century—Voltaire was not among the kindly disposed—indicate that the genre had made some progress toward winning greater esteem in the Republic of Letters.

A perusal of the six chapters comprising the *Tableau des mœurs* does not materially alter the reader's conception of eighteenth-century society, obtained from acquaintance with better-known authors. The lesser novelists bear out the observations of Marivaux on the barriers in the way of a match between an aristocrat and a nobody. The town gentry are frivolous and corrupt as one sees in *Le Paysan parvenu*. Gambling and debauchery are their chief diversions. *La petite maison*, of Bastide (1763), describes in detail one of the numerous "nids d'amour" of the time, decorated by contemporary artists. As for the *haute bourgeoisie*, the corruption of magistrates and the tendency of judges and doctors to ape the dissolute and haughty bearing of

¹ It is regrettable that more care was not exercised in reading the proofs. Page references for the evidence used are often lacking, as are adequate bibliographical details for many items in the list of *Ouvrages consultés* (pp. 254-59). Quotation marks are used erratically (cf., e.g., pp. 9, 85), and evident misprints are: *Felding* for *Fielding* (p. 21); *respectacle* for *respectable* (p. 76); a totally illegible note (p. 88, n. 2); a misplaced note reference (p. 115); *lunapar* for *lupanar* (p. 168); proper name incomplete (p. 174); *conviendrait* for *conviendrait* (p. 177); commas omitted (p. 183); *s of des* dropped to line below (p. 185); *fut* for *fût* (p. 195); *renseigné* for *renseigné* (p. 210); *remarquerq* u'il for *remarquer qu'il* (p. 215); *Jance* for *Janzé* (p. 256; cf. p. 245 and Lanson, No. 7467); *Jeçe* for ? (p. 256); *du Saust* for *du Sauzet* (p. 259).

the nobility provide matter for comment, as they had done for Sorel and for Furetière. Daughters and sons of noble families forced to choose between the church and undesirable marriages, and younger children driven into the church as the one means of livelihood in order that estates may be kept intact for their seniors; the corruption found in religious houses; the abbés *petits-mâtres*—these phenomena appear as well in the better-known fiction of the time—many of them in *Manon Lescaut*, a work which is excluded from the purview of this study as giving less attention to the *mœurs* of the time than to other concerns.

Les Lettres de Thérèse, of Bridard de la Garde (1737), give a detailed description of the theater: the actors and the way they read their lines; the authors, with Voltaire in their midst; and the dandies on the stage, more interested in drawing attention to themselves than to the play. Sainte-Colombe, too, in *Les Plaisirs du jour* (1746), adds to this picture characterizations of contemporary artists of note: Mlle Clairon, Mlle Dumesnil, Mlle Gaussin, MM. Le Kain, Delainville, Belcourt, Dubois—and indicates the *engouement* of the public for Italian music and actors at the expense of the native product. De Mouhy, in *Anne de Moras* (1739-40), depicts vividly the spectators gathered at the Comédie Française to see *La Métromanie*, with Crébillon fils and, perhaps, Prévost among them.

Novels by Mauvillon, Mme Levesque, and others depict army life. The professional officer had little chance of promotion without protection or purchase, was often invalidated on a tiny pension after years of service, and had small occupation in peace times except drinking, gaming, and loving, details which confirm the accuracy of Prévost's presentation of the chief interests of Manon's brother. Similarly, the minor novelists confirm what we know of the wealthy financier of the epoch from Labruyère, from *Turcaret*, from *Manon*, and from *le Paysan parvenu*. He has won his fortune by fraud or extortion, and uses it to live luxuriously and to win admission for himself and his children to the highest social circles.

An examination of the evidence regarding the reliability of the pictures given by the novelists leads Mr. Green to conclude that their representation of the situation in the church, on the stage, among the nobility, in the army, and among the *nouveaux riches* is substantiated from other sources, and consequently, that the contemporary novel bears reasonably reliable witness to the manners of the period. One may add that this study is more than a resuscitation of authors, more or less deservedly forgotten. It serves—even though quite indirectly—to enhance the merit of authors like Marivaux and Prévost, whose work has remained fresh with life, for it confirms the essential truth and adequacy of their portrayal of contemporary polite society. In addition, the work of these authors has the advantage of bearing the stamp of great talent, which appears to be conspicuous chiefly by its absence in the volumes so carefully analyzed in the study before us. Mr. Green is, therefore, in a certain sense, the victim of a well-known view of literary history. In many

cases, it has been justified by its fruits. Not infrequently, however, its followers must journey along knowing that mountain peaks are hidden in the cloud-band on the horizon, but forbidden by their consciences to allow their attention to wander toward the heights, away from the flat and slightly arid plains.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

ALGERNON COLEMAN

Les relations de voyages du XVII^e siècle et l'évolution des idées. Contribution à l'étude de la formation de l'esprit du XVIII^e siècle. By GEOFFROY ATKINSON. Paris: Librairie ancienne Édouard Champion, 1925. Pp. 220.

Having thoroughly familiarized himself with certain very fascinating and romantic material in *The Extraordinary Voyage in French Literature before 1700* (1920) and *The Extraordinary Voyage in French Literature from 1700 to 1720* (1922), Professor Atkinson has now written a small, but substantial, volume which relates this and additional material of a related sort to the history of ideas in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. His work is another excellent demonstration of the old contention that "literature" in its proper sense is the most inclusive of all studies, combining and assimilating the essentials of philosophy, history, sociology, religion, and economics in addition to its own more popularly recognized functions.

Stated briefly, Professor Atkinson's thesis is that the lacuna preceding certain well-known eighteenth-century theories and doctrines which culminated and received their best expression in the encyclopedists and the Revolution, is bridged by an intelligent perusal of the accounts of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century voyages, some true, some fictitious, but all having Montaigne's idealistic essay on cannibals as their indirect fountain-head. From this source grew the "rationalism" of the eighteenth century, in the sense of "*science fondée sur l'expérience*" and "*sur la méthode expérimentale*." To the proof of this thesis the author devotes ten chapters, all stimulating, though in different degrees. The only question which might be raised is whether the thesis is treated sufficiently in the light and perspective of trends of thought from other quarters during the same period.

In general, the documentation of the work is very satisfactory, although Professor Atkinson states beforehand that his conclusions are based on only about a hundred accounts. The first chapter, "Les philosophes et les idées," is perhaps the most general in respect to references, although certainly this method is superior to the far too prevalent one in some places today of asserting source-indebtedness on the flimsiest of foundations. The second chapter, "Théories et faits politiques," discusses suggestively the motto, "Liberty, equality, fraternity," as finding its origin in the observations of travelers

upon the conditions of so-called "savage" states. Here—and, as a matter of fact, in many of his chapters—there is a certain amount of unavoidable repetition, because of the necessary overlapping of conclusions based on the idealization of primitive societies. Thus, "equality," the second member of the redundant slogan named above, would really imply the rest of the triad. These theories, however, are then shown as reaching their practical application in "*Les 'républiques' d'outre-mer*," of native as well as of missionary and emigrant formation.

Two interesting chapters, especially to students of English literature, are those on "*Le bon sauvage*" and "*Le sage chinois*." If Professor Chauncey B. Tinker could have read the first before writing his *Nature's Simple Plan*, he would not have betrayed the lack of perspective that he did in discussing the novelty of the enthusiasm for the "State of Nature" in late eighteenth-century England. The similar craze for criticisms of English society through the mouth of some foreign observer, especially a Chinaman (a craze attaining its height in Goldsmith's *Citizen of the World*¹), may be proved to have had an early origin in France.

The chapter, "*Critique politique et économique*," is not so interesting as that on "*Les idées déistes*," which itself is surpassed by that on "*Les idées anti-chrétiennes*." This chapter, treating as it does the direct and indirect undermining of some of the accepted facts and precepts of Christianity by showing how the effects of Adam's fall as described in Genesis (such as childbirth in pain and shame at nakedness) failed to be corroborated among the savages, is the most original and ingenious of them all—in fact, in one or two cases such as the foregoing, one wonders whether the ingenuity does not overshadow the validity, since absolute links connecting these observations with Genesis are practically missing. But, on the whole, the points on "*Immortalité sans Révélation*," "*Enfants nés de vierges*," "*Chronologie*," "*La tradition chrétienne*," etc., are well taken.

A miscellaneous chapter, "*Autres idées*," composed of fragmentary discussions of the ideas of "progress," "Ancients and Moderns," "relativism," "the exotic spirit," "sensibility," and "rationalism," is followed by one entitled "Conclusions." This latter is frankly disappointing, since it contains little more than a summary of what has been said very clearly before. If the last two or three pages, showing the influence of all these streams of thought on a leader like Pierre Bayle, had only been developed into a concrete indication of the effect of this "voyage literature" on the intellectual leaders of the Revolution, the book would have ended on the major chord the rest of it (despite slightly faulty proofreading) deserves.

ARTHUR H. NETHERCOT

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

¹ R. S. Crane and H. J. Smith have already shown how greatly indebted Goldsmith was to the *Lettres chinoises*, by the Marquis d'Argens (1739). Cf. *Mod. Phil.*, XIX (1921), 83-92.

Heinrich von Kleist's Conception of the Tragic. By WALTER SILZ.
Hesperia No. 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1923.
Pp. 95.

In view of the lack of any comprehensive study of Kleist's conception of the tragic, Dr. Silz investigates this theme, which he considers essential to an understanding of the dramatist. He asserts that Kleist's view of the tragic is marked by an organic development from the catastrophe of pure misunderstanding to the genuine tragedy of will and character, in which reason, once the tempter to destruction, becomes the deliverer from misfortune and the vanquisher of tragedy. A division of Kleist's works is made into three groups, each of which marks a distinct stage in an evolution based upon personal experience.

The plays of the first group—*Die Familie Schroffenstein*, *Robert Guiskard*, *Amphitryon*—are designated as the product of Kleist's disillusionment over Kant. Like Kleist, the characters are baffled by forces which are unintelligible to them; they grope about blindly in a world where pure truth cannot be attained. In *Die Familie Schroffenstein*, which is dominated by the impotence of reason, the mind and the heart prove equally invalid as guides of life. Dr. Silz views *Robert Guiskard* as a more intense formulation of the same view of tragedy. The hero, an individual of almost superhuman proportions, is a victim of a natural phenomenon, of the plague. This has no causal connection whatsoever with his acts, but intervenes capriciously, irrationally, and unintelligibly, thwarting Guiskard at the very moment when he is about to complete the carving out of a gigantic destiny. Kleist's growing ability to portray an impressive character merely serves to heighten the effect of tragic irrationality. *Amphitryon* is characterized as in keeping with Kleist's spiritual development and as a "tragedy of the fallibility of feeling in a human being who stands under the shadow of an uncomprehended fate." Here the seat of the tragedy is entirely within the soul of the heroine, Alcmena.

The works of the second group—*Die Marquise von O*, *Penthesilea*, *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn*—are viewed as representing a period of transition, and as preparing for the conception of the individual as a member of society. The problem in *Die Marquise von O* is related to that of Alcmena, in that both women experience the tragic perplexity attendant upon finding themselves innocently guilty. But in this narrative the superhuman element is lacking, and the forces at work are humanly comprehensible. This serves to establish a basis in reality for purely human tragedy. The loneliness peculiar to Kleist's characters is emphasized in the case of the Marquise. Dr. Silz states that the tragedy of *Penthesilea* is based upon her attempt to unite two incompatible views of life. For although destined to wreck the foundations of the Amazon state, she nevertheless feels a loyalty to that state. In her case, tragedy is seen to result from the limitation of human reason, from the unreliability of reason, and from conflicting feeling. *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn* is

characterized as a deviation from the direct course of development and as a drama in which there is "no conflict or confusion of feeling, hence no tragedy in Kleist's sense" (p. 57). After more than nine pages of analysis the author concludes that this drama portrays a compensatory ideal and that in a negative way it presents an indictment of the disorder and unhappiness in this world. I regard it as a decidedly unfortunate expedient to devote to a play, that avowedly lacks tragic content, approximately one-tenth of the space of a monograph intended to deal with the conception of the tragic.

In the third group—*Michael Kohlhaas*, *Die Hermannsschlacht*, *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*—the important element is the conception of the state and the relation of the individual to it. Tragic effect in *Michael Kohlhaas* is seen to arise out of a peculiar irony. Through an idealistic devotion to justice, Kohlhaas himself becomes unjust, a robber, and a murderer. This situation develops out of the conflict between the inflexibly abstract, idealistic conception of justice peculiar to him and the relative view of justice, based somewhat on expediency, held by the state. The latter is represented as far from deserving unqualified respect and devotion. *Die Hermannsschlacht* is another drama which is discussed at length although the author states that no element of the tragic is developed in it. To be sure, some reference to this drama as well as to Kleist's life is necessary in portraying the development of Kleist's changing attitude toward the state. Yet, in spite of his admission that *Die Hermannsschlacht* is not inherently tragic, the author has devoted practically one-seventh of his monograph to its discussion. *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* is characterized as the first instance of tragedy in the purest sense, since here the old favorite theme of the inadequacy of reason as a cause of tragedy is outweighed by serious weakness in the character and will of the hero. The tragic problem of the Prince seems insoluble as long as he regards it from an egocentric point of view, but it is overcome as soon as he relates it and himself to a higher unit—to the state. Kleist's final conception of the tragic is summed up as follows: "Tragedy ceases to be tragic when it is seen in significant relation to a higher necessity" (p. 92). And again:

In *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* a new view of the tragic is asserting itself, a view that sees tragedy no longer as a blind and final catastrophe, but as a mere transient incident in the moral development of the hero. . . . The tragic experience is not an irretraceable descent; it does not terminate the career of a hero in glory or disaster, but it serves instead to create the hero; it is a phase, and a salutary phase, in his evolution [p. 93].

In view of the extended analysis of *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn* and of *Die Hermannsschlacht*—both of which have no inherently tragic content—it is rather surprising that no word of explanation is given to account for the omission of some of Kleist's prose narratives that contain tragic situations. Failure to do so lays the author open to the charge of arbitrary selection. If one were disposed to be contentious, one might argue with Dr. Silz over such points as pronouncing Kleist a philosopher, including no bibliography of

works referred to, and not always (pp. 33, 75) citing by title. Yet these are minor points, some of which are merely a matter of technique. The conclusion might have been strengthened considerably by a terse formulation of the points established. The clarity of style is admirable. Dr. Silz has treated an important subject in a stimulating, thought-provoking manner and has carefully related Kleist's personal experience to his theory of the tragic.

JOHN C. BLANKENAGEL

OHIO WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

Sir Gawain & the Green Knight. Edited by J. R. R. TOLKIEN and E. V. GORDON. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1925. Pp. xviii+211.

Not in sixty years has there been occasion for reviewing a new edition of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, and Richard Morris' edition of 1864 had so poor an apparatus that recent reprints of it omitted Introduction, Notes, and Glossary. The reason for the apparent neglect of one of the best medieval English poems is the enormous difficulty of vocabulary and style. The work, on the Oxford Dictionary, new editions of other alliterative poems, and the increasingly exact knowledge of English dialects, Old French, Old Norse, and Celtic have thrown new light on the vocabulary of *Sir Gawain*, however, and though they may not have revealed the precise meaning and connotation of strange words, they have replaced sheer guessing with probabilities or at least possibilities. All of this material the editors of the new edition have used to the full; they have given a complete Glossary, in which words are associated with some possible etymological source or at least with words known elsewhere. Moreover, they have printed a conservative text, with few emendations, some (not highly important) corrections of previous misreadings, and (as far as I can find) no misprints. They have punctuated the text admirably. Hence the edition is a good one; for it makes the poem available to readers who have not an extensive knowledge of Middle English and do not wish to spend hours hunting for information about rare words.

To some students the edition may seem the best possible, but to others it will seem, like most things made by human minds, faulty in some respects. The Introduction will seem to many not quite satisfactory. Its "History of the Legend," in particular, is a very slight sketch of one theory of the relations between *Sir Gawain* and the other poems which have a head-cutting episode. Further, its "Select Bibliography" omits many important items, articles which in some cases the editors undoubtedly used. The bibliography of *Sir Gawain* is not so extensive as to preclude giving a fairly complete list of articles, and if space was precious, one can see no reason for including one book of selections (out of the many which print a part of *Sir Gawain*), unless that had been Maetzner's, or for listing *A New English Dictionary*, knowledge of which surely might be assumed (its date, by the way, should be 1884—).

One general feature of the edition which will seem to some a defect is the failure to acknowledge the indebtedness of the editors to other scholars. Actually one who knows the "literature" of the subject perceives that the editors have been able to contribute very little new material to the elucidation of the poem. Their work has been the patient collection of details, the selection of the best explanations, the decision to accept or reject emendations; and that they have done well. But they do not credit emendations to their authors, and often they do not name the scholar from whom they received ideas or facts for their notes. For instance, in line 1467 they mention two scholars whose treatment of the word *schafted* they do not accept, but they fail to state that their explanation is that of Professor Knott.

Fuller information about the views of scholars when they are not accepted would be desirable also, for readers might not agree with the editors. For instance, the explanation of *dryuez* to in line 1999 seems to me unconvincing, and hence Napier's emendation should be mentioned. Again in line 681, the explanation of *hadet* as (be)headed is possible (I had made the guess myself), but hardly more likely than Napier's *hakel* (which is not mentioned). The one implies error in writing *a* for *e*, the other, in writing *d* for *k*. A case which is not an emendation is line 438, where the manuscript's *ho we* is given as *he were* (following Morris). Professor Knott suggested that it should be *nowe*, the first stroke on the *n* being just a bit high, and examination of the manuscript causes me to agree. Yet Knott's reading is not given. The effort to avoid emendation in lines 1623-24 seems to me unconvincing. Here Professor Thomas' suggestions should be mentioned; so should his suggestion about *bay* in lines 967. Other examples of the same sort might be added.

Of the few emendations accepted, some are unnecessary. The *New English Dictionary* cites another example of *foranes* (l. 646). It also gives examples of *caryez* used intransitively with meaning "go" (to these may be added *Sege of Jerusalem*, l. 255). In lines 777, *gederez* is paralleled by *Patience*, line 105; hence, though Napier's reasons for the emendation are cogent, it would have been best to keep the original reading and give the emendation in a note. In line 1014, & need not be changed to *pat*. In line 1386, the same emendation is unnecessary, and *wonnen* need not be inserted (literally, "and I have this, in worthy fashion, within dwellings").

In general the Glossary gives the best meanings which are now known for words. But if one looks up *lede* and *leue* for line 98, one gets meanings which do not give sense in the passage: *lede* is derived from the source of *lead* and given the meaning "set (risk) against," which is unlike any meaning I can find for the word in the *New English Dictionary*; *leue* is glossed "to allow" (what can "each one allow other" mean?). Professor Ker used to read this, "life laid for life, each to trust other." In line 295, *elles* surely means "provided that." In some way either Glossary or Notes should make clear the facts about words of doubtful meaning, but they generally do not. For instance, *in her first age* (l. 54) is glossed "in the prime of life," without citation

of evidence. *Anelede* (l. 723) is a problem, which may or may not be solved by the definition given. *Bi mount* (l. 718) is given a meaning entirely different from that which the *New English Dictionary* assigns to it, without comment. In line 958, *chymbled* is given a meaning and derivation that are very uncertain. In line 1284, *lode* is given different meanings in Glossary and Notes, both of them dubious. In some cases (e.g., the notes to ll. 327, 457, 1074) the editors do give excellent discussions of difficult words.

The notes are in general pertinent and sound. Those to lines 33, 35, 36, however, are not warranted: the passage does not imply that the source was written in "alliterative staves" or that there was "continuity of alliterative tradition." The meaning of lines 67-68 seems to me probably this: When people met each other on New Year's Day, the first who called out "Year's gift" received a present from the other; hence the "other" was said to have lost. (A similar custom exists among the negroes in the southern states.) "As wares" should be omitted from the Glossary's definition of *jezed*. In line 90, the fact that reference is made to Arthur's custom of not starting dinner till an adventure had been reported, and that the custom is mentioned in another story which contains the head-cutting game, is not evidence that "the author got it from his original." Reference should be made to the *Vulgate Romances*, which give the origin of the custom (Sommer's edition, II, 320). In line 709, such information as I have been able to find indicates that Madden's citation of the Chapel of the Grene in Cumberland is of no value for the poem. Its proper name should be Grune or Groyne. In explaining their preference of *lord* to *knyzt* (l. 991) as the emendation for *kyng*, the editors say, "lord is more than thirty times applied to Sir Bercilak"; but numbers haven't much significance in such a case as this: the question is, Is it more likely that the scribe miswrote *kyng* for *knyzt* or for *lord*? Examples of scribal confusion of *kyng* and *knyzt* abound (Professor Knott mentioned some, but many more could be found). The assumption that *kyng* was miswritten for *lord* is altogether less likely, and the editors give no examples of such an error. Moreover, Bercilak is called *knyzt* in lines 1581 and 1936. The editors add: "Alliteration rather than internal rhyme agrees better with the general practice of the poem in the 'wheel.'" But *knyzt* gives alliteration with *comaundet*, and the fact that *knyzt* and *lyzt* rhyme is a mere chance.

As will be seen from the foregoing, the present edition of *Sir Gawain* does not solve all the problems of the poem. In particular, we have much to learn about the poet's diction, the exact meaning and connotation of his words, and the poet's reasons for using some of the unusual ones. Dr. Brink in his *Stab und Wort in Gawain* (which seems not to have been known to the editors) has thrown considerable light on the poet's methods of using words, but much remains to be done. Date and place of composition, the question whether the author of *Sir Gawain* wrote the other poems in the manuscript or any other poems which have remained to us, and the audience for whom he wrote, are still unsolved problems. The editors of this edition, by making

available in compact form most of what is now known of the poem, have done a meritorious service to scholarship, and the Oxford Press is to be congratulated for the beauty of the book which it has produced.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

J. R. HULBERT

A History of Restoration Drama: 1660-1700. By ALLARDYCE NICOLL. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1923. Pp. vi+397.

A History of Early Eighteenth Century English Drama: 1700-1750. By ALLARDYCE NICOLL. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1925. Pp. xii+431.

The first history of English drama to show adequate documentation of Restoration materials was issued in 1923 by the Cambridge University Press for Professor Allardyce Nicoll. This year another volume from the same hand carries the story on to 1750 in the encyclopedic manner of its predecessor. Both books are filled with new facts from contemporary periodicals and state records and have pointed comments on the plays in question. Thus the two volumes constitute a timely continuance of Chambers' noteworthy history of the Elizabethan stage. Mr. Nicoll has used a great mass of facts in his critical study. He has gathered the necessary materials for a real history of the playhouses and the dramatic companies and has studied the plays themselves with extraordinary diligence.

The text of the first volume is divided into three parts designated as "The Theatre," "Tragedy," and "Comedy." In the volume on the early eighteenth century a fourth part seemed necessary for an account of its operas, pantomimes, and burlesques. Each part is divided into smaller units of dramatic measurement and the whole is drawn to scale. The last third of each book is devoted to appendixes giving many new and valuable data under three heads: "The History of the Playhouses," "Select Documents Illustrating the History of the Stage," and a "Handlist of Plays." The Indexes that follow are satisfactory except for a loss of items under the letter *L* in the 1923 volume that seems due to the dropping of a sheet. Perhaps the most remarkable proof of careful research is in the Handlist for the 1700-1750 period; therein Mr. Nicoll presents itemized records of all known performances of every play named as new during that time. In plan and execution the two works are satisfying, and as reference works for dates and titles virtually indispensable.

Each main division of *The History of Restoration Drama* has something to arouse other scholars to further research. The history of the playhouses is developed from a critical examination of stage directions in the quartos and by notes on the musical and dancing accompaniments of the spoken parts. In the space given to tragedy, much is said regarding the origins of heroic drama in earlier English materials, thereby lessening the credit of French

tragedies and romances for that specific *genre*. In fact, the main thesis of the first book is to establish an unbroken tradition for English drama from Elizabethan to modern forms, a program of accomplishment more feasible in the realm of tragedy than elsewhere.

In the part on comedy there is skilful use of old as well as of new methods of criticism. The usual attributions to French sources are given for various plays, and then fresh estimates of how the borrowings were utilized. This is particularly well done in the analysis of Molière's influence. When showing the English sources, Mr. Nicoll in similar style runs over the general debt of Restoration comedy to Jonson, Beaumont and Fletcher, and Shirley, with few changes of the established opinions regarding their influence. He then restates the case of Shadwell to prove that dramatist's diversity and also his interchange of comic method with Congreve and others. Some of the best criticism in the book brings out the various borrowings of one writer from another within the Restoration group. In rating the work of single authors Mr. Nicoll shows the same sort of independent thinking. Wycherley, for example, is given much the same historical position as in the studies of C. Perromat (1921) and G. B. Churchill (1924); then comes a critical valuation of his contradictory emotional appeals and shortcomings in taste.

The History of Early Eighteenth Century Drama defaults only in the omission of the Licensing Act of 1737 as being too well known for inclusion. Otherwise the book is remarkable for its full and orderly record of evidence. The analysis of tragedy gives critical categories that will become basic in all later histories of the period, for actual proofs of growth from seventeenth-century materials justify immediate recognition of Mr. Nicoll's terminology. Of minor significance are the high rating given Charles Johnson, who has been emerging as a strong influence on Lessing and other Continental dramatists; the new perspective given for Addison's *Cato* and other plays that have had constant attention; and many additions to our knowledge of scenes, costumes, and stagecraft.

In the matter on comedy there is a still more analytic study of kinds. The difficulty is greater because much of eighteenth-century comedy had no singleness of purpose; also, our critical terminology has been confusing rather than discriminating. Mr. Nicoll points out basic characteristics of early sentimental comedy in a way to remove some of the perplexities that arose from attempts to make "sentimental" an inclusive term; yet in using the studies of previous critics Mr. Nicoll has built upon their work instead of demanding an entirely new valuation. He has given the "reformed" and "genteel" comedy of 1696-1722 a clear relation to contemporary taste whereby the truly sentimental works may be felt as distinctly of their own character. Quite as significant is the evidence of a reviving interest in romantic comedy amid the influence toward classical restraint. Here there is gratifying addition to Odell's study of the Shakespeare vogue by a thoroughgoing study of repertoire. In showing exactly what plays were staged in London during

given seasons Mr. Nicoll illustrates how thoroughly he has searched the periodicals for theatrical records, and he thereby draws attention again to the painstaking labor behind his handlists of plays.

The attention of all interested in this field of English studies is directed to the indicators used in the two handlists to mark plays known to Mr. Nicoll by name only. A starred title may be found in the catalogue of some library here or abroad, whereupon the location of the copy and the characteristics of the play should be made known. A few such additions to the items of Mr. Nicoll's lists have been found in the United States, and from such manuscripts as are in the Huntingdon Library many more unpublished plays may be brought to light. These additions will barely indicate our great obligation to Mr. Nicoll for laying the groundwork of all further research in this field.

DAVID HARRISON STEVENS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Some Native Comic Types in the Early Spanish Drama. By WILLIAM SAMUEL HENDRIX. *The Ohio State University Bulletin*, "Contributions in Languages and Literatures," No. 1. 1924.

This study, a doctoral dissertation of the University of Chicago, is an attempt to analyze the main comic characters in the Spanish drama from Juan del Encina to Juan de la Cueva. It is divided into four parts as follows: (1) "The Churchman"; (2) "Some Foreign and Dialectal Types" (including the negro, Moor, Italian, Frenchman, German, gypsy, *salvaje*, Jew, *vizcatno*, language plays); (3) "The Stupid Group" (including the shepherd, *bobó*, *simple*, etc.) and "The Clever Group" (including the confidential servant, *rufián*, braggart soldier, etc.); (4) "Some Comic Devices" (including language, sleeping, eating, burlesque or parody, genealogy, asides, boasting, quarreling, fear, etc.).

Professor Hendrix has read with care the readily accessible sixteenth-century plays and has presented to us the stage traditions regarding the various comic characters. We might wish that a more adequate background had been given for the first two sections. Here, as elsewhere, the author quotes occasionally from non-dramatic literature, but no definite attempt is made to link stage traditions with the testimony of other writers or with historical records. The criticism of dishonest and dissolute members of the clergy on the stage is interesting as reflecting popular opinion, but it forms only a small portion of the protests voiced in a more serious vein by countless high-minded persons of that day. There is lack of perspective, for example, in the statement that Sánchez de Badajoz, a curate, most of whose plays were performed before clerical audiences, "for some reason did not like the clergy" (p. 8). The Moor was ridiculed for his aversion to wine and pork, and the negro for his ignorance of the language, though he knew his prayers after a fashion, but with respect to the social status of these unhappy creatures we still know next to nothing.

Professor Hendrix emphasizes the virtual identity of the jargon of Moors and negroes. It seems to me that with the exception of the language of the negress Margarita in Güete's *Comedia Tesorina* the speech of the Moor and negro differs considerably in our plays. With due allowances for inconsistencies of transcription by playwrights and printers, some of these texts give us a fair idea of the way Moors and negroes pronounced "Spanish." A line in Vicente's *Cortes de Jupiter*, namely, "*mi no xaber que exto xer*," contains the three errors most commonly made by Moors in our texts: inability to use subject pronouns correctly; the use of the infinitive to express all persons, numbers, and tenses of the verbs; and the pronunciation of *s* as the voiceless prepalatal fricative *x*. We are familiar with the last-named peculiarity in the explanation of *xabón*, *jabón*, from *saponem*. The negro jargon found in Castilian and Portuguese texts deserves special study, but in general it may be said that the negroes pronounced initial and medial *d* as *r* (*turo*, *riabo*); *j* as *s* (*vieso*, *hisito*); and *l* as *r*, of which we have a good example in the *Farsa teologal* of Sánchez de Badajoz:

rabame cara semana
cando rababa ros paños.

The occasional loss of *s* before a consonant in the negro jargon (as *etar*, *pator*) may have led Professor Hendrix to speak of the language of Moors and negroes as *cecear*, of which we have good examples in the speech of the gypsies and in the pronunciation of Fray Vegecio in the *Comedia Tesorina*. It probably lay outside the scope of Professor Hendrix' volume to study the dialect used by the shepherds in the plays of Encina and other playwrights, but such a study should be made along the same lines as in Eckhardt's monograph on *Die Dialekt- und Ausländertypen des älteren englischen Dramas*.

In dealing with the foreign types, the amusing French (or Italian) dentist in the *Farsa teologal* is not mentioned. The reference to "the *borbon*, the Condestable" (p. 23) who leads the attack in Juan de la Cueva's *El saco de Roma* is scarcely adequate in dealing with a well-known historical figure.

Greater unity of treatment would have been secured, in my opinion, if the third and fourth sections had been combined. Since most of the comic devices were employed by the so-called "Stupid Group," a considerable amount of repetition would have been avoided by considering them together. I doubt whether many will agree that in the expressions "Am I dreaming? Am I asleep?" and in the comic use of dreams is found the suggestion of the theme of *La vida es sueño* (p. 73).

There are a number of errors in the bibliography of plays which serves as the Appendix. "Guillén de Avila" should be "Diego de Avila"; *Nise lastimosa* and *Nise laureada*, of Bermúdez, were published in 1577, not 1551; the author of the *Tragedia de Narciso* was Francisco de la Cueva y Silva, not Francisco de las Cuebas, etc. The many misprints that occur here and throughout the text will be readily corrected by the reader.

J. P. WICKERSHAM CRAWFORD

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Roxburghshire Word-Book. By GEORGE WATSON. Cambridge: The University Press, 1923. Pp. viii+343.

The present work is an account of "the special vernacular vocabulary of the county of Roxburgh," by which limitation is meant in this case that standard English words are omitted, and also words that are generally Scottish; in addition there is an appendix of specimens of the dialect. The author, who is of the staff of the *New English Dictionary*, is a native of Jedburgh, Roxburghshire, and he used the dialect, he says, until he was twenty-six years old. In his work on the Oxford Dictionary his knowledge of vernacular was often of the greatest help, and he soon began to realize the philological importance of his own dialect, and to note down matters of interest. Of the inception of the investigations that followed and of the plan of the *Word-Book* he tells us in the Preface, and more fully in an article entitled "Recent Records of the Scottish Speech," printed in the *Hawick Archaeological Society's Transactions* for 1924. The latter contains first an account of Roxburgh dialect material so far published, glossaries, etc., and the work done by the Scottish Dialect Committee, appointed in 1907, and of that of the Philological Society, as well as individual authors. As far as Roxburghshire is concerned, however, the work accomplished is largely the work of Mr. Watson, both in the matter of collecting, aided by selected helpers, and in the matter of articles on this or that phase of the vocabulary. Thus he published in the *Kelso Chronicle* in 1914-16, and in June, 1921, a number of articles on localisms, dialect centers, and other topics, and on such special subjects as "Provincial Terms in Agriculture," "Kelso Plant-Names," etc. Further, in April-July, 1915, he discussed "The Dialect of Upper Teviotdale" in seven articles in the *Hawick Express*, and finally he wrote thirteen articles for the *Jedburgh Gazette* in 1915-16 on words of that particular region.

Roxburghshire has three subdialects ("Recent Records," p. 4): Tweedsdale, Teviotdale, and Liddesdale. Thus we have again an illustration of how dialects grow up in valley centers. The author early observed that the various centers are characterized by notable differences in respect of vocabulary; and through correspondence and personal investigation he has sought to make his work as complete as possible upon this point. And right here he makes an exceedingly interesting observation which I will quote:

On one occasion I sent a particular word-list for annotation to an aged correspondent of extensive knowledge in Kelso district, and in this he especially marked one term connected with the recreations of youth as "long obsolete; never heard now; very common when a boy." On my sending a duplicate list to a young man in the same locality, he annotated this term as "very common among boys, and in everyday use," or words to that effect.

By taking advantage of the lesson taught by this the author has been able to show that many a word thought obsolete or obsolescent is in living use there at the present time. As we grow away from the diversions of childhood, we forget the words, but the diversions and the vocabulary connected with them live on for the most part.

It was observed above that the delimitation adopted excluded standard Scottish.¹ There is a drawback in this: we do not get a complete picture of the use of words; words generally Scottish may often, I would judge, reveal a use here that is rare or lacking elsewhere. Also it must often be hard to draw the line: such words as *byre*, "cow-house," *lowe*, "flame," *stoond*, "sharp pain," and *gar*, "to cause," can easily be assumed to be current, but there will no doubt often be less clear cases. However, I have a good deal of confidence in the judgment of the author also upon this point. He has wished to offer a book of words that are "distinctive of Roxburghshire, past and present, gathered from its literature, as well as from living witnesses old and young." It is not the purpose here to review in detail what the author has accomplished in this volume. I shall merely note some things that characterize the dialect as here presented. Mr. Watson's book is a contribution of major importance to the study of English-Scottish dialects in general; it is painstaking, thorough, and scholarly. It is doubly welcome because so little has been done for Scotland in the way of glossaries or studies of particular dialects, aside from that fundamental investigation, *The Dialect of the Southern Counties of Scotland*, by J. A. H. Murray in 1873. In this connection I am especially glad to learn from Watson's "Recent Records," page 6, that there are in active preparation at present studies in the vernacular of East Dumfries, Northeast Roxburgh, Ayrshire, Midlothian, Forfar, and Buchan, while an etymological dictionary of the dialect of Orkney had before been announced.²

The following may here be noted. Page 15: In Teviotdale the normal pronunciation is with *iu* for *u* in all such words as "blue," "blew," "threw," "rue," etc. The rule is stated as follows: "It [that is, *j*] is also developed, giving *ju*, between *l*, *j*, or *r* and *u*," which I assume is a misprint in listing *j* also with *l* and *r*. Hence the above words are spoken *blju*, *thrju*, and *rju*. This is also the pronunciation in rapid speech elsewhere, we learn. Teviotdale exhibits the most striking dialectal development, as particularly in the extensive developments of the diphthongs *ou* and *ei* (hence the name "the *yow* and *mei* dialect of Teviotdale," p. 31). That is, the pronoun "you" is not pronounced *yu*, but *yow*, "through" becomes *throw*, etc.; similarly *i* (written *e*) in "he," "me," "we," "be," etc.—these are not pronounced *hi*, *mi*, *wi*, and *bi*, but, diphthongally, *hei*, *mei*, *wei*, *bei*. And similarly diphthongation to short *ow* in *bowt*, *browt*, *thout*, for English "bought," "brought," "thought." It is to be noted, too, that here the equivalent of English *o* with a vanish (*oʷ*) is this diphthong *ow*, as in the words "scope," "choke," "pony," etc., hence *scowp*, *chowk*, and *powni*; here, then, we may say, roughly speaking, that the development of the diphthong has passed from the initial stage of English *scowp*, halfway, in *scowp* toward the diphthong *au*. I note here that in connection with the examples *yow*, *yows*, etc., is also listed the verb *louse*, which is

¹ Some exceptions to this rule are noted, "Recent Records," p. 5, as words rich in Philological interest.

² Professor W. A. Craigie, of Oxford, now of the University of Chicago, is preparing a dictionary of the earlier Scottish language, from the twelfth to the seventeenth century ("Recent Records," p. 6).

equated with "to loosen." If it be the English verb, then it is a case in point. But Scottish *louse* (*lowse*) is probably from ON adjective *lauss*, and the verb *louse* is possibly here also of the same source.

Pages 32-34, under suffixes: The rather extensive use of the ending -ar for English -ary may possibly be wholly due to French influence, for the words are apparently all of French origin (*ordinar*, *necessar*, etc.). On the other hand, the ending -it, so characteristic of Scottish, is perhaps chiefly due to Norse influence, as in *baggit*, *ballit*, etc. Norse dialects all have masses of such adjectives; and in the Scottish-Norse dialect of the Shetland Islands it is the prevailing adjective ending, and almost any adjective may have this form. Of Scottish suffixes, -ie is perhaps the commonest in Roxburgh; and, as in Lowland Scotch in general, it is very often diminutive in function, and sometimes of pejorative force. But its scope is apparently wider still in Roxburgh, as in such instances as *crowdie*, "oatmeal and water," *baikie* (also *blaikie*, with strange L-infix), "wooden collar for a cow," *bauwie*, "a broad shallow milk-dish," and *birtie*, "a spindle-whorl." It may be noted first that the suffix -ie is used with nouns or adjectives, as a term for a thing or a person, from the point of view of appearance or characteristic activity, as a *beardie*, "one with much beard," *batchie*, "a baker" (from *batch*, "baking"), and *bleckie*, "an imp" (from *bleck*, "smut," "black man"). Of great interest is another very large group of such forms in which the ending -ie replaces the second part of a compound or other omitted element, illustrated by the author on page 34 in such examples as *bantie* for "bantam," *bullie* for "bullfinch," *goldie* for "goldfinch," *hangie* for "hangman," *postie* for "postman," etc. (Of those listed, *hankie* for "handkerchief" is also American, but hardly any of the others so far as I know.) In *baggie* (also American) for "rutabaga, rutabago," through the pronunciation *rutabaggie*, we have, of course, merely a case of subtraction of the first part.

Page 39: *Aftercast*, "consequence." I am inclined to regard this as a Norse use; cf. Oic *efterkost*, noun plural, "after-effect."

Page 61: *Blinker*, "a lively, engaging girl." Cf. Norwegian *blinka*, "to give signs with the eyes," "to wink."

Page 63: *Bolgan*, "a swelling that becomes a pimple," quoted from Jamieson. Gaelic *bolgan*, "pimple," is suggested as the source. ON *bolginn*, "swollen," is also to be compared, as the source of both; but the Scottish form would indicate direct borrowing from Gaelic.

Page 83: *Chatty-puss*, and *cheetie*. The author compares French *chat*; however, the -tt- of the first rather suggests the Norse *kjetta* (and Norwegian *pus*), but this, on account of the ch-, would then require the assumption of a change from *kettie* to *chettie* under modern influence, or a borrowing in modern times.

Page 119: *Dunner*. This is clearly just the noun "thunder," and only more remotely OE *dun*, ON *duna*.

Page 137: *Fottie*, "a short-legged, plump child," "a young dog" (and *fotty*, adjective, "of hens: having feathery legs"). With formations of this kind

based on the word for "foot" are to be compared numerous Shetlandic and Scandinavian formations.

Page 139: *Frig*, "a female of light-hearted disposition." Compare Norwegian dialect *frigga*, "en stor grov Kvinde" (Ross). But perhaps not to be referred to the pagan goddess *Frigg*. The Scottish noun is apparently to be referred directly to the verb *frig*, "to act vainly," etc.

Page 150: *Ghult*, "a scowl." There is a whole body of words here corresponding to semantically similar formations with mainly the gradation vowel -u- in Norwegian dialects, Shetlandic, etc.

Page 155: *Grimin*, "a sprinkling or thin covering of snow." With this is to be compared Norwegian dialect *grim*, "fint Nedbør af Sne eller Regn under svag Vind" (Ross), and *grima*, ON "covering," "mask." The Scottish word would show earlier verbal use of *grime*, "to cover," "conceal."

Page 158: *Guiss*, "a pig," and *guissie*, "a pig, sow, or swine," for which the author gives the variant *gissie*, and the compound *guissie-pig*. It is doubtful if the Norwegian *gosse* cited is the direct source, though the vowel allows this etymology (as Scottish *buid* = English "board"). But just as in Norwegian dialects *gris*, "pig," used in calls to pigs, becomes *gis* or *giss*, so possibly here the form *gissie* is from *gris* + suffix -ie; and of this, then, the form *guissie* is a variant. By the side of *guiss* (*goss*) there should be (or once have been) a form *giss*.

The above are merely a few matters that have occurred to me as I have been going through the book¹; there are a great many other things I have marked, but I have already taken more space than I intended. Perhaps, elsewhere, I shall be able to discuss more fully some other things of the contents of this exceedingly valuable and to me interesting collection of Lowland Scottish dialect material. I shall finally quote the following brief specimen of the dialect, retaining the usual spelling: "[The devil's presence was announced by a] gowstie wind, which soupit owre the houses, and often tirl'd the thack to the bare bougars;² and though it gar'd the divots stour off the house riggins and every caber dunner, his lang black gown hang straucht to his cutes ne'er i' the least caruffled."

There is no attempt to determine the extent of the different language elements in the dialect in the present volume.³ I am able to say, however, that according to a letter from Mr. Watson, dated March 9, 1925, he is considering the writing of a series of articles for the *Scottish Border Papers* on the "Cymric, Scandinavian, Gaelic, Flemish, and Old Northumbrian features, and chapters on the newer word-lore, writers, etc." It is hoped that he will do so, and that this material will then also be published in book form.

GEORGE T. FLOM

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

¹ On page 10, ON *druk*n should be *druk*ken (apparently purely a misprint).

² "Beams."

³ An appendix shows that there are over fifty words of gypsy origin in the dialect of Roxburgh.

